ESSAYS AND CRITICISMS

BEING

A COLLECTION OF ARTICLES SELECTED FROM THOSE CONTRIBUTED TO THE CALCUTTA REVIEW (FIRST SERIES), THE MODERN REVIEW AND THE PRESIDENCY COLLEGE MAGAZINE

SYAMACHARAN GANGULI, B. A.,

HONY. FELLOW, CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY AND LATE PRINCIPAL, UTTARPARA COLLEGE, BENGAL.

LUZAC & CO., 46 GREAT RUSSELL STREET,

LONDON.

1927.

All rights reserved.

PREFACE.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary about a year and a half ago suggested my publishing in book form a selection of my contributions to periodicals. After a very long deliberation I have at last come to the decision of acting up to the suggestion.

I have contributed altogether seven articles to the Calcutta Review (First Series) from the year 1877 to the year 1903. Their subjects and the months and the years of their publication have been the following :— 1. Bengali, Spoken and Written, October 1877. 2. A Universal Alphabet and the Transliteration of Indian Languages, April 1881. 3. Hindi, Hindustani and the Behar Dialects, July 1882. 4. The Language Question in the Punjab, October 1882. 5. The Behar Dialects—A Rejoinder [to Mr. (now Sir) George Grierson's Article "In Self-Defence" in the Calcutta Review for October 1882], April 1883. 6. Transliteration *versus* Phonetic Romanization, October 1897. 7. The Royal Titles and Imperial Federation, April 1903.

My contributions to the Modern Review have been the following :— 1. The Direct Method of Teaching Foreign Languages, September 1908. 2. The Partition of Bengal, November 1911. (Written in October 1910). 3. Steps towards Reduction of Armaments,

January 1914. 4. More about Reduction of Armaments, July 1914. 5. Some Ethical Aspects of the Present War and of its Probable End, November 1914. 6. The Teutonic, Latin and Slavonic Races of Popular Ethnology, January 1915. 7. The Rev. J. Knowles's Scheme for the Romanization of All Indian Writing, February 1918. 8. The Undesirability of Devanagari Being Adopted as the Common Script for All India, April 1918. 9. Hindi or Hindustani, June 1918. 10. Bengali in Indo-Romanic Small-Letters, October 1918. 11. Self-Determination as the Basis of a Just Peace, February 1919. 12. The International Phonetic Script, May 1919 13. Esperanto *versus* English Internationalized, November 1919. 14. Indian Nationality and Hindustani Speech, February 1920. 15. End of Fighting among Nations, August 1921. 16. Reform of Fighting in Courts of Law, September 1921. 17. Reform of Fighting in Courts of Law. No. 2, May 1923. 18. Self-Determination and India's Future Political Status, January 1923. 19. Combined British and American Lead in Boycotting War, August 1923. 20. India's Two Great Gifts to the World, December 1923. 21. Phases of Religious Faith of a Bengali of Brahman Birth, August 1924. 22. Steps towards a World Federation, January 1925.

Of my Calcutta Review Articles, the first and most important one was published in 1906 in booklet form, with the addition of an Appendix at the end of the

article. The article as thus expanded is incorporated in the present collection, and a new remark is added to the Appendix. No other Calcutta Review article is selected. The second and the sixth articles contain indeed matters of general interest. But they are not selected because their essential points are repeated in two Modern Review articles which strongly demand selection.

Of my Modern Review articles, twelve full articles and an extract from one are selected.

My single contribution to the Presidency College Magazine is selected. Two small omissions in the article are supplied, and one sentence now considered unnecessary is left out.

136, CORNWALLIS STREET,
CALCUTTA.
April 1, 1926.

SYAMACHARAN GANGULI

PREFACE TO THE REPRINT OF THE CALCUTTA REVIEW ARTICLE OF OCTOBER 1877 WITH THE ADDITION OF AN APPENDIX.

The Bengal Government Resolution of February 1905 on the subject of the Establishment of Rural Primary Schools in Bengal having brought the question of primary education to the fore, the issue of a reprint, in pamphlet form, of my *Calcutta Review* article of October 1877, entitled "Bengali, Spoken and Written," has appeared to me desirable. The few additions and alterations in the present reprint are almost entirely of a verbal character. On one point only have my views undergone a change, and this change is indicated in an additional note put within crotchets. In another additional note, also put within crotchets, attention is drawn to the fact that it is only in a loose way that Bengali can be said to be *derived* from Sanskrit.

The system of transliteration adopted in respect of Sanskrit words is the authorised one, with the single exception that when ˙ stands for the *anusvára*, it is represented by *ṁ*, the authorised *ṅ* being used only when it stands for the *anunásika*. In regard to the phonetic transcription of Bengali words, the following points have to be specified, for the authorised system of transliteration falls short of requirements here. The points are that *a* stands for অ, short and

long ; that *á* stands for the ordinary sound of আ, short and long, and also for the sound of আ . in আজ, short and long ; that *o* stands for the ordinary o-sound, short and long, as in পোড়ে (burns), and also for the o-sound, short and long, in প'ড়ে, পড়িয়া (having fallen) ; that *e* stands for both the e-sounds, short and long, in বেঁটে (short), the second sound being the ordinary one ; and that the Bengali *anusvára* (ং), the same in sound as ঙ, is represented by *n*. The supplementary character e^2 is used for representing the sound of এ in এক— a *quite* different sound from the ordinary sound of এ though allied to it ; and the supplementary character y^2 is used for representing য (the same in sound as জ). Further, *sh* is used for representing the Bengali sh-sound, whether expressed by শ, ষ, or স. The Bengali pronunciation of an appropriated Sanskrit word follows the word, and is put within parentheses.

September 25, 1905. SYAMACHARAN GANGULI

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

ERRATA.

Page	Line				
7	12	Omit	,		after Bengali.
,,	22	Read	(*krito*)	for	(*krita*),
14	27	,,	should	,,	whould.
17	31	,,	signifying	,,	signifiying.
18	25	,,	French	,,	Freneh.
21	2	,,	fellow-countrymen	,,	fellow coun-trymen.
,,	29	,,	expressions	,,	expression.
25	6	,,	mother-tongue	,,	mother tongue.
36	26	,,	consistently	,,	conistetly.
47	5	,,	conversation	,,	converation.
,,	14	,,	যথা	,,	ষথা
48	16	,,	Bengali	,,	Bangali.
62	9	,,	matter-of-fact	,,	matterof fact.
68	2	Add	THE	before	PARTITION.
69	24	Read	disturb	for	distrub.
72	17	,,	sometime	,,	sometimes.
88	18	,,	against	,,	agianst.
89	26	,,	known	,,	konwn.
90	2	,,	patriotism	,,	partiotism.
126	3	,,	practical	,,	parctical.
157	17	,,	dissimilar	,,	dissimalar.
,,	21	Add	a	before	compound (second in the line).

164	18	Read	letter	for	etter.
164	18	,,	z-sound	,,	z-soundl.
171	12	,,	ञ्	,,	ञ
,,	,,	,,	r̲	,,	n̲.
185	10	,,	induce	,,	iuduce.
200	31	,,	sound	,,	ound.

The writer regrets that owing to extreme old age and bad health he could not look over the proofs himself and he begs the reader to excuse numerous printing mistakes that have crept in.

I. BENGALI, SPOKEN AND WRITTEN.

From the Calcutta Review for October 1877.

The language of a people is a reflex of that people's mind. In language is faithfully mirrored every stage of social progress. Human development can never rest fixed at a point; language, like other human appurtenances, must, therefore, change. In the past languages have changed, and in the future too, they must change, unless, by some inconceivable process all human affairs were to come to a stand-still. But people who speak any particular language at a particular time, scarcely ever imagine that that language would ever change; and the great majority of Englishmen and Frenchmen, at the present day, little think that the languages they speak, now so full of vigorous life, could ever undergo any very extensive modification. Without a knowledge of the past history of languages, the possibility of a change would indeed be inconceivable. To the ignorant, therefore, lingual change must be an absolute inconceivability. But that people fully cognizant of the unstable—changeable character of languages should nevertheless try, though in vain, to give fixity to the written form a language assumes when it has arrived at a certain stage of evolution, by persistently ignoring changes that have actually taken place in that language as spoken at a

later stage of evolution, would be quite unintelligible, but that we actually find this to be the case. In this, as in a host of other cases, we find that things, after they have acquired a definite form of existence, do obstinately resist the action of all antagonistic forces. This principle of conservation must be particularly strong in literary languages, for these are sure to be supported by the whole weight of learning; and learning in all ages has made itself the champion, in numerous instances, of the outgrown, the obsolete, and the useless. The bias of learning has thus helped to keep the written language of every country, at any given time, a little behind the spoken, a little archaic in comparison with the latter.*

Another difference between written language and spoken must arise from the fact of the former being altogether a higher instrument than the latter. In oral conversation, there cannot be anything like that systematic grouping—that co-ordination and subordination of thought—that there can be in writing. Orderly grouping of thought does not necessitate, however, any

* In some respects, however, the written language of a country must be in advance of the spoken Increasing knowledge makes it necessary to borrow or invent new words, and such words must make their way into colloquial speech through the written language The invention of words like *oxygen* and *international*, and the adoption (in English) of words like *verve* and *geist* are cases in point New words relating to the ordinary affairs of life, must first make their appearance, however, in colloquial speech, and gradually force their way up to books. But for all this, the most advanced phase of a language at any given time must be the form of it currently spoken at the time. The *best* model for writers to follow would, therefore, be the *spoken* tongue.

departure from the current grammar or the current vocabulary. It is only in poetry, and other artistic productions, that archaisms are allowable for the sake of æsthetic effect.

Some difference then between written language and spoken may be unavoidable from the very nature of things—nay desirable; but it is certainly as desirable that this difference should be at its minimum. In our Bengali language, however, the divergence between its spoken and written forms, is about as wide as it well can be; and a discussion of this question, with suggestions for remedying the evil, is to form the subject of the present paper.

Grammar and vocables exhaust the whole field of spoken language. In respect of written language, however, the graphic system has further to be considered.

First, in respect of grammar, written Bengali differs from spoken Bengali far more than is perhaps the case with any other living human language. Indeed obsolete grammatical forms which, if employed in speaking, would call forth laughter, are the accredited book Bengali forms. Dramas, novels, and newspapers have indeed begun to partially adopt current grammatical forms, and this I look upon as the instrument which is destined eventually to effect a thorough revolution. Men are gradually being accustomed to see in print colloquial forms side by side with the usual obsolete forms used in writing. Old associations are being thus

gradually loosened and men's minds prepared for the utter exclusion in writing, eventually, of the grammatical forms that have become extinct in the spoken tongue.

Some of the inflexions of nouns and pronouns, the conjugations of verbs, and the distinction of gender in nouns and adjectives, furnish very important points of difference between spoken Bengali and written. Several of these differences are to be traced to the influence of Sanskrit, and have been in part but recent innovations in a backward direction; while the others are archaic forms kept up in writing after they have dropped out of use in the spoken tongue. Illustrations will best shew the extent of the differences.

The proper Bengali plural termination of both nouns and pronouns is *rá* in the nominative case, and in this the book language is at one with the spoken. Along with the *rá*, however, Bengali forms collectives by adding words signifying a group, and these words in current Bengali are *guno, guni, gulo, guli, gulin* (corruptions, probably, of the Sanskrit *gaṇa*), and *sakal* (*shakol*). Written Bengali, though employing *guli* and *gulin*, and also *gula* for *gulo*, and *sakal* (*shakol*), delights in the use of words of a genuine Sanskrit stamp—*gaṇa* (*gan*), *samúha* (*shomuha*), *vriṇda* (*briṇda*), *maṇḍali* (*monḍoli*), &c.—words that are never employed in current speech.*

* European scholars are often misled by our book Bengali and so-called Bengali grammars. Prof. Max Muller, in his *Stratification of*

In the oblique cases of nouns, too, there are differences. Current speech has *ámáder* for the obsolete *ámádiger* (ours) and *ámádigake* (us, to us) of books.

Into written Bengali, a vocative case has further

Language, says, "We have learnt that in some of the dialects of modern Sanskrit, in Bengali for instance, the plural is formed, as it is in Chinese, by adding a word expressive of plurality.......," pp. 11 and 12. Another eminent orientalist, the extent and depth of whose knowledge of the Indian Aryan vernaculars surpasses that of any other living scholar, has fallen into the same error, and doubtless from the same cause. Mr. Beames, in his article on the early Vaishnava poets of Bengal, in the *Indian Antiquary* for February 1873, has the following:—"There is [in the Bengali of Bidyapati's time] no distinctive form for the plural. When it is necessary to express the idea of plurality very distinctly, words like *sab*, 'all'; *anek*, 'many' and the like are used. Occasionally also we find *gana*, 'crowd,' as a first faint indication of what was subsequently to become the regular sign of the plural in Bengali." *Gaṇa* is no doubt the regular plural sign in book-Bengali, but it is *never* employed in current speech. The modern plural stands for the old dual and plural both. *Rá* is a plural termination in this sense; *gaṇa*, however, is a true collective. It will never, even in writing, be used for two individuals. The employment of the plural form in Bengali is far more rational than it is in English. When a numeral or any other adjective signifying more than one, qualifies a noun, the plural termination is *universally* dropped, which is the case in a few instances only in English. In Hindustani, the dropping is not universal, as it is in Bengali. Hindustani nouns ending in *á* particularly refuse to drop the plural termination. Final *á* has kept Hindustani backward also in other ways. Adjectives ending in *á*, including participles and the genitive particle *ká*, are the only Hindustani adjectives that are declined. The full significance of the mischief that the distinction of gender in adjectives with a final *á* has done, can be understood only when it is considered that it is this that keeps alive the artificial distinction of gender in Hindustani at all. If Hindustani participles (both present and past) did not all end in *á*, and if there were not likewise a large number of ordinary adjectives ending in *á*, the artificial distinction of gender, which is the worst defect of the Hindustani language, would have long since disappeared. Spoken Bengali knows no distinction of gender in adjectives, and has the gender of nouns entirely coincident with sex, being in this latter respect superior even to English, which yet continues, in a few cases, to assign gender to inanimate objects. That this artificial assignment of gender is not an altogether defunct principle in the English language, is seen in the fact that the railway train has been femininised.

been introduced. Our learned Pandits have evidently thought it an imperfection in Bengali that it should not have the full complement of Sanskrit cases. In the Bengali grammar books read in our schools, the Bengali cases are given the same in number as the cases in Sanskrit. The fact, however, is that the instrumental case is wholly wanting in Bengali, the idea of instrumentality as well as agency being expressed, like numerous other relations, by some post-position after the genitive. The vocative case also is altogether wanting, the nominative form being universally employed in address. In this latter case our Pandits have been in sore straits. They have not been able, as in the matter of the instrumental case, to erect the genitive with certain post-positions into a case. They have transferred, therefore, bodily the Sanskrit vocative form into Bengali ; and so it is that words like *sakhe* (*shakhe*), *pitah*, &c., have taken a firm hold of written Bengali

The Bengali instrumental too calls for remark. The current language is without any instrumental case, agency being expressed by putting *dvárá* (*ddárá*) after the genitive, and instrumentality by putting *diyá* (*diá*) or *de* after the accusative in the case of persons, and after the nominative form in the case of things. In writing, an instrumental (expressive of agency as well as instrumentality proper) is manufactured, however, by the employment of *dvárá* (*ddárá*) and by dropping the genitive sign of the preceding noun. There is besides another word, *kartrik* (*kortrik*), very largely employed in

writing, to indicate agency, but which, when employed in oral speech, becomes a true post-position by coming after the genitive case.

The ablative case-ending of books is always *haite* (*hoite*), the corresponding colloquial form *hote* being at the same time occasionally employed in novels and dramas. For expressing the ablative relation, however, *theke* and *tháiñ* (after the genitive) are more largely employed in current speech than *hote*; and in this, as in other kindred matters, there can be no reason why the written should differ from the spoken language. The plural oblique case forms of book Bengali, differ also from those of spoken Bengali. *Digake* (accus. and dat.) and *diger* (gen.) of the former, are represented by *der** in the latter.

The difference in the verb forms may now be pointed out. In the spoken tongue, the infinitive and the perfect participle have the same form; for instance, *kará*='to do,' 'doing'; and *kará* also='done.' Bengali grammar books would scarcely recognise the form *kará* at all. The infinitive would be put down as *karan* (*karon*), and the perfect participle as *krita* (*krita*). But unwilling though our grammar-makers are to admit the actual infinitive and perfect participle forms as *correct* forms, these forms are actually employed in writing. This, however, is not enough. The

* *A'mdder*, for 'to us,' seems to be abbreviated from *ámádigarke*, the post-position *ke* being dropped. *Der* itself is an abbreviation of the Persian *digar*.

corresponding Sanskrit forms, except such as have been thoroughly naturalised in the spoken tongue, should be eschewed entirely; for where the resources of the language do of themselves suffice, no benefit can result from borrowing.

The following table will show the most important differences in the verb forms of written and spoken Bengali :—

	Book Bengali	Calcutta Bengali	Bankura Bengali	Maldah Bengali	Dacca Bengali.
(I) am doing (We) are doing	*Karitechhi**	*Kochchi*	*Kochchi*	*Kochchhi*	*Koritechhi*†
(I, we) have done	*Kariachhi*	*Korichi*	*Korichi*	*Korichhi*	*Koriachhi*†
(I, we) did	*Karilam*	*Kollum*	*Kollum, Konnum*	*Kollem*	*Korlam*
(I) was doing (We) were doing	*Karitechhilam*	*Kochchilum*	*Kochchilum, Kochchhinum*	*Kochchhilem*	*Koritechhilam*†
(I, we) used to do	*Karitam*	*Kottum*	*Kottum*	*Kottem*	*Kartam, Kortam*
(I, we) will do	*Kariba*	*Korbo*	*Korbo*	*Korbo*	*Korbo*

It will be seen that the Bengali dialects spoken in the Western half of Bengal differ much less from one another in point of grammar than each does from the standard book-Bengali. The East Bengal dialects would seem to be nearer this standard, but in the long run they would tend more and more to divest themselves of their peculiarities and shape themselves more and more after the pattern of the metropolitan dialect. The very inability of East Bengal people to pronounce aspirate sounds marks out the dialects they speak as inferior, at least in one respect, to those spoken in the western

* In all the words in this column *a* is sounded as *o*.
† The *chh* in this column stands for the East Bengal ছ, which has very nearly the sound of *s*.

section of the country. East Bengal people themselves are anxious to assimilate their speech to that of West and Central Bengal. All peculiarities whatever of the East Bengal or any other Bengali dialect need not, however, disappear. But on this subject the writer's views will be stated more fully further on.

The subject of gender next calls for remark. In the living Bengali tongue there is no trace left of any artificial distinction of gender, but in writing, this worst of encumbrances is sedulously kept up. If *prithivi* is feminine in Sanskrit, it must be so perforce in its Bengali form, *prithibí* (*prithibi*), and this although the Bengali language has now utterly outgrown that stage of grammatical development in which there is an arbitrary assignment of gender to inanimate objects. Not only in assigning gender to the names of lifeless things do Bengali writers seek to carry the language back to a state it has outgrown, they Sanskritise the grammar farther by assigning gender to adjectives, a thing quite foreign to the spoken language. On this point, it may be maintained that in cases where the noun of which it is an attribute, is of the female sex, the adjective in spoken Bengali does take a feminine form. This too, I think, is only partially true, if true at all. *Buddhimatí*, *rúpabatí*, *sundarí* (*shundori*) are used in connection with the names of persons of the female sex. But such adjectives have come to be used substantively in the language, and their being regarded as female names has much to do with their application in the current

language. That words like *buddhimán, buddhimatí,* &c., are used substantively cannot be disputed. The crucial test of inflection proves that they have become substantives in Bengali. It is enough to mention that *buddhimáner*, and *buddhimatíke* are in use in current Bengali. With regard to *sundarí* (*shundori*), it has further to be said that *sundar* (*shundor*) is certainly used in connection with feminine nouns, at least by people unlearned in the book language.

Even if the point that a few Sanskrit adjectives naturalised in Bengali still retain in the latter language their original feminine forms were fully conceded, it would by no means follow that every adjective taken from Sanskrit should retain the same privilege. That a distinction of gender in adjectives is wholly alien to the genius of the Bengali language is plain from the fact that no genuine Bengali adjective is ever varied in respect of gender : *moṭá, chhoṭo, kálo,* &c., would be used both for males and females ; Bengali being here unlike Hindustani, which has its *moṭá* and *moṭí, chhoṭá* and *chhoṭí, kálá* and *kálí,* &c. In the matter of gender, as in most other matters, a slavish adherence to Sanskrit has very much encumbered the written Bengali language.

The union of words by means of *Sandhi* is a characteristic feature of the Sanskrit language, but not of Sanskrit alone. There is such union in French, as *d'or* from *de+or*, and in Arabic, as *us-saltánat* (pronounced such, though written *ul-saltánat*), and *ud-din*

(pronounced such, though written *ul-din*). In Sanskrit, however, there is more of such union perhaps than in any other human language. *Sandhi* is a very intelligible, rational process in Sanskrit. By it 'economy of breath' is secured. But though a rational process in Sanskrit, it is unreason itself when transferred bodily, as it has been, into Bengali. An illustration will shew this best :—*Manu+ádi=manvádi* in Sanskrit. This is very intelligible indeed : *uá* changes, for facility of pronunciation, into *vá* or rather *wá*. What is this *sandhi*, however, in Bengali ? *Manu+ádi* (in Bengali) =*manbádi* to the eye, and *mannádi* to the ear. Bengali Pandits teach, as if it were an unalterable law of nature, that উ (u) is changed into ব (ba). The bewildered pupil cannot of course see the rationale of this, and he plies hard his memory, therefore, to get by heart what he is taught. Indeed a good deal of stupid docility is necessary to make one learn the rules of Sanskrit *Sandhi* as they are taught in Bengal. The object of *Sandhi* in Sanskrit was economy of labour. In Bengali, it is only a mystification and an obstruction. *Manu* (*Monu*) *ádi*, in Bengali, would be quite faultless. *Manbádi* (*mannádi*) would be pedantry merely.

The question of *Samása* need not detain us long. *Samása* adds greatly to the power of a language ; and it may be necessary to sparingly borrow, from Sanskrit, words compounded agreeably to the rules of *Samása*. There are, however, genuine *Samása* compounds in Bengali, which in this respect has a somewhat higher

capacity than Hindustani, which forms only a few compounds of this sort, such as *pan-chakkí*, *jeb-katṛá*, &c. In Bengali, however, there are lots of such compounds: *áñb-gách*, *shoshur-bári*, *hát-báksho*, *gáñṭ-káṭá* are instances. Instead of servilely borrowing from Sanskrit in every instance, it would be more rational to avail ourselves of the inherent capacity of our language, and form compounds out of its existing materials. The adoption of compounds like *Janaika* is wholly indefensible; for, to say nothing of the fact that, in Bengali, *ek jan* in writing=*e²k* jon* in sound, is, on psychological grounds, a preferable expression to *jana eka*, we have already in Bengali, in addition to the ordinary *ek jan* (*e²k jon*), the expression *jonek* in *jonek-dujon*. *Janaika* serves, therefore, no other purpose than to display before the reader the writer's knowledge of Sanskrit grammatical rules.

Bengali, though superior in many respects to Hindustani in the simplicity and logical accuracy of its grammatical structure, is inferior, however, to the latter, in several ways. It is not so self-sufficing as

---

* The Bengali alphabet inadequately represents the vowel sounds of the language The unrepresented sounds are the following:—

1. The *á* in *dál* (pulses) and *kál* (to-morrow or yesterday) as differing respectively from the *á* in *ḍál* (branch) and *kál* (time).
2. The first *e* in *meje* (floor) and *meṭe* (earthen) as differing from the first *e* in *meje* (on table) and *mete* (be settled).
3. The *e* in *e²k* (one) and in *be²ṅ* (frog). This sound corresponds with that of a in 'man.'
4. The *o* sound in *ghoti* (water-pot), which is written *ghaṭi*. The difference between this o-sound and the normal o-sound in Bengali is clearly perceived on comparing *gole* (having melted) with *gole* (in noise).

Hindustani is; it is much poorer in its derivatives, and must have, accordingly, to lean more upon its parent tongue, Sanskrit. It has few abstract nouns of its own, derived from current attributive or common terms. To the attributive terms, *moṭá, lambá, chaorá,* &c., it has no abstract terms to correspond, such as Hindustani possesses in *muṭái, lambái, chaurái,* &c. The phrase '*lambái chaurái,*' in its figurative sense, has been appropriated by Bengali from Hindustani. Verbs in Bengali have scarcely any personal nouns derived from them; there is *chalá,* for instance, corresponding to the Hindustani *chalná,* but no word to answer to *chalnewálá. Khâiye, gáiye* and a few other words may be mentioned as instances of verb-derived personal nouns; but besides being extremely limited in number, some of them have a specialised meaning. *Khâiye* means not 'eater,' but 'a good eater.' *Kheko* and its feminine *kháki* from *kháoá,* are slang terms. In respect of abstract nouns derived from verbs, such as 'knowledge' from 'know,' Bengali and Hindustani are nearly equally in fault, and both have, therefore, in most cases, to borrow. In borrowing abstract terms from Sanskrit in the case of Bengali, careful discrimination, however, is necessary. In Sanskrit, abstract terms are formed by adding *tá, twa* and *ya* to the attributive root-words. In the Bengali language, abstract terms in *tá, twa* (pronounced *tto*) and *ya,* which last re-duplicates the final consonant of the attributive and adds thereto the sound of o, are found; but in respect of new

importations, it would be best, perhaps, if they could be restricted to abstract terms in *tá*. This particle undergoes no change of sound in Bengali like *twa* and *ya*; and it is besides more consonant to the genius of Bengali to form derivatives by additions at the end of the root-word, without causing any internal change in the root-word itself, while *ya*-formed terms change the vowel sound of the root-word; as for instance, *prádhánya* (*prádhánno*) from *pradhána* (in Bengali *prodhán*). This latter circumstance gives *tá* no advantage, however, over *twa*. Indeed, *twa*, with its Bengali sound of *tto*, has unlike *tá* and *ya*, been thoroughly naturalised in Bengali. Truly Bengali words, such as *baro* and *chhoto*, form abstract nouns by the addition of the *tto*-sound. The right course for us would seem to be to recognise *tto* as a Bengali abstract suffix, and to give it a wider extension than at present. Perhaps examples drawn from other languages may help us to overcome our love for the *twa* of writing, which old association has generated. The Latin *trinitas* has given rise to It. *trinità*, Fr. *trinité*, Sp. *trinidad*, and Eng. *trinity*. When such modifications have been undergone by a Latin abstract suffix, and those modifications have been distinctly recognised in highly cultivated living European languages, why should not a similar modification, in Bengali, of a Sanskrit suffix be duly recognised; why whould it be kept so disguised by a vicious system of writing as to pass as identical with its parent form?

The want of ordinals may be mentioned as another instance of the natural poverty of the Bengali language. Ordinals are borrowed from Sanskrit, and from Hindustani also in the single instance of dates, up to the 18th. In this latter case, however, the ordinals have become in fact substantives. The genitives of the cardinal numerals do in colloquial Bengali the work of ordinals; *duiyer*, *tiner*, &c., stand for 2nd, 3rd, &c. Often, instead of the genitive form of the cardinal numeral, a noun in the genitive form is used after the cardinal. Thus 'third day' would be expressed, not by *tiner din*, but by *tin diner din*. This is no doubt a cumbrous circumlocution, but things must be taken as they are.

As regards the ordinals then, since the existing resources of the Bengali language suffice for expressing all that is expressed by means of ordinals, there is no necessity for falling back upon Sanskrit. A larger use of the genitive forms of numerals than is now made in the current language seems to be the direction in which writers should work, instead of overburdening the language with the Sanskrit ordinals. When Sanskrit and Bengali numerals do differ but slightly, as *pancha* and *pāñch*, an incorporation of corresponding Sanskrit ordinals may not seem to be the introduction of a discordant element. When any of the higher numerals, however, are taken, it is found that the Bengali words, by reason of their higher trituration and integration, differ greatly from their Sanskrit originals; and in such cases the Sanskrit ordinals, if

used in Bengali, would seem highly discordant. 'Sixty-fifth' is *poiñshoṭṭir* in current Bengali, while the Sanskrit for it is *pan̲chashashṭitama*. In addition to the reason that such a word as the last is not needed in Bengali, its very length ought to be a serious objection. If any borrowing, indeed, were necessary in the present case, I would be more for giving preference to the handier ordinals of the Hindustani language to their seven-leagued Sanskrit counterparts, especially as in this very case, there has been borrowing already from Hindustani in the matter of dates, *pahlá, dúsrá*, &c., from Hindustani being loan-words in Bengali. The Sanskrit ordinals, that have been thoroughly naturalised in Bengali are few, as *prathama* (in Bengali *prothom*), *dvitíya* (in Bengali *ditio*) and *dvádas'a* (in Bengali *dádash*). It need hardly be repeated here that I do not in this matter advocate borrowing at all. It is to be mentioned also that our Bengali writers do not confine themselves to borrowing the ordinals from Sanskrit, but borrow, without any necessity whatever, the cardinals also. 'Eleven,' for instance would be *ekádas'* (*ckádash*) and not *egára* (*e²gáro*) ; 'forty,' *chatvárims'at* (*chattáriñshat*)and not *challis'* (*chollish*) ; 'two hundred,' *dui s'ata* and not *du s'a* (*du sho*) ; 'twenty-five thousand,' *pan̲chavims'a sahasra* (*pan̲chobiñsha shahossro*), and not *pañchis* (*poñchish*) *hájár*.

Besides those already mentioned, there are other derivatives, likewise, which a cultivated language cannot do without. In our current Bengali speech,

for instance, we have a word for 'man,' but none for 'human,' a word for 'do', but none for 'practicable.'* In cases where the existing formative powers of the language do not suffice, it would be best to fall back upon Sanskrit. Care, however, should be taken that our language is not unnecessarily burdened; that it is not made to depend more upon the rules of Sanskrit grammar than is absolutely necessary. The object aimed at should be to bring Bengali to a position of independence, and not to keep it perpetually in leading strings. Indiscriminate borrowers from Sanskrit ought, again, to remember that to master the rules of Sanskrit grammar requires a considerable expenditure of brain power, and that if Sanskrit grammatical forms are to pass current in written Bengali, a large number of human beings will have to incur such expenditure for the acquisition of knowledge of even a most elementary character. But more about this hereafter.

The question of grammatical forms being disposed of, the even more important question of vocables may now be taken up. The inflected forms of words, as well as other derivatives, are indeed vocables, inasmuch as they have each an independent existence in

* In current Bengali, the genitives of nouns and infinitives do duty, respectively, for attributives like 'human' and 'practicable.' Besides the advantage gained in respect of variety of expression, an important purpose is served by terms like 'human,' which express all sorts of relations, that of possession being included. The genitive, whatever its original signification may have been, tends to be restricted by the idea of possession, and this specialisation of meaning makes it necessary that there should be derivative terms signifiying all sorts of relations.

the language. What has been said about grammatical forms and derivatives covers therefore a part of the present subject. Grammatical forms and derivatives fall under a few general laws, however ; and these laws form but a small item by the side of the numerous body of main words, which, though originally significant of attributes, have come to be now for the most part mere conventional symbols for objects and ideas. What is to be said here about vocables may be understood to apply to this latter class of words.

The vocables in use in Bengali, written and spoken, are divisible into three classes. (1) Sanskrit-derived* words, but so much altered from their original forms as to have necessitated their being written differently from Sanskrit. (2) Sanskrit words bodily transferred, which, though retaining their original spelling, are for the most part pronounced in a specifically Bengali way. (3) Words of non-Sanskrit parentage.

The first class of words forms the great body of the spoken language. In the written language, however, they are generally not admitted except in dialogues. Their Sanskrit originals, as a rule, get the perference, and they themselves are cast aside as vulgar.† In

[* It is only in a loose way that Bengali can be said to be *derived* from Sanskrit, just as in a loose way a Romance language, French, for instance, can be said to be derived from Latin. Bengali is really a direct descendant of a provincial Prakrit allied to Sanskrit, just as French is a direct descendant of a particular kind of Provincial Latin.]

† The rejection of words that are really vulgar is no way objectionable. But why words that are in the mouths of the highest-born and the most learned should be rejected as vulgar, is what certainly passeth my comprehension.

mere introductory primers, current words are for the most part employed, but side by side with them, there occur also their Sanskrit originals. If there are such words as *bhái*, *kál* (to-morrow), *nák, kán, soná* (*shoná*), &c., there are also *bhrátá, kalya* (*kallo*), *násiká* (*náshiká*), *karṇa* (*karno*), *svarṇa* (*sharno*), &c. It seems, colloquial words are employed at all simply because there is no doing without them. The child knows them and knows no others, and must be first taught to read by means of words that he knows, and not by means of their learned equivalents. But the great object aimed at is to teach the pupil such equivalents in as much profusion and within as short a time as possible. So soon, therefore, as he has mastered the difficulties of Bengali alphabetic writing, one important part of his education comes to be the acquisition of Sanskrit vocables, accompanied by a sedulous inculcation, on the part of the teacher, that in writing, these vocables should be always employed in lieu of Bengali words that he is familiar with. *Every child in Bengal that learns to read has to learn the Sanskrit equivalents of the commonest names.* He has learnt to call 'copper,' *táñbá* or *támá* (?) ; 'leaf,' *pátá* ; 'head,' *mátá* or *máthá* (?) ; 'horse,' *ghoṟá* or *ghoñṟá* ; 'rice,' *chál* ; and so forth ; but these he must discard for *támra* (*támmro*), *patra* (*pattro*), *mastak, ghoṭak, taṇḍul*, &c. What is the earthly good of all this, it is not easy to see ; and yet the fact is nothing less than what it is here stated to be. The case is just as if every French

child that learns to read and write were taught to write *ferrum* for *fer*, *aurum* for *or*, and so on to the end of the lexicon. From such a heavy and galling, but most unnecessary burden, deliverance is certainly desirable; but an established order of things has necessarily a vast body of adherents, so that deliverance must be very slow in coming after all.

The displacement of familiar Sanskrit-derived Bengali words by their Sanskrit originals can be justified on no reasonable grounds. The ousting of words of non-Sanskrit origin, whether aboriginal or foreign, is equally indefensible. Purism is radically unsound, and has its origin in a spirit of narrowness. In the course of free communings among nations, there must be borrowing and giving. Can anything be more absurd than to think of keeping language pure, when blood itself cannot be kept pure? No human language has ever been pure, any more than any human race has been pure. Infusion of foreign elements does, in the long run, enrich languages, just as infusion of foreign blood improves races. Seeing then that languages, as men speak them, must be mixed, impure, heterogeneous, to reject from books words like *garib* (*gorib*), from Ar. *gharib*, and *dág*, from Pers. *dágh*, on account of their foreign lineage would be most unreasonable. Current words of Persian or Arabic origin connect us, Hindus of Bengal, with Musalman Bengalis, with the entire Hindustani-speaking population of India, and even with Persians and Arabs.

Is it wise to seek to diminish points of contact with a large section of our fellow countrymen, and with kindred and neighbouring peoples, with whom we must have intercourse, in order that we may draw closer to our Sanskrit-speaking ancestors?

Human happiness would seem to be better promoted by increased points of contact with *living* men than by increased points of contact with remote ancestors. But men are very often swayed in these matters by sentiment more than by reason. The feeling that impels Bengali Hindus towards Sanskrit is perfectly intelligible. With Sanskrit are associated the days of India's greatest glory; with Persian and Arabic, the days of her defeat, humiliation and bondage. The budding patriotism of Hindus everywhere would therefore naturally eschew Persian and Arabic words as badges of slavery. In the long run, however, considerations of utility are sure to override mere sentimental predilections.

It should be understood that I do not advocate any fresh introduction of Arabic and Persian words, but insist only on the desirability of giving their full rights* to such words as have already been naturalised in the language, and are in everybody's mouth. Persian and Arabic words used by Bengalis ignorant of

* The *Sulabh Samáchár*, a professedly popular journal, is doing most useful work this way. But even the *Sulabh* is not wholly free from Sanskrit predilections. The word *sulabh* itself, in the sense of 'cheap,' is an unnecessary importation, and such expression as সময় কর্ত্তন, তদুপরি, রণতরি, &c do occur in the paper. But for all this, the people of Bengal are deeply indebted to the *Sulabh*.

those languages ought to be accepted as right good Bengali. As a matter of fact many such words, those connected with Law especially, are employed in writing, but the purist spirit is still very active, and a disinclination to admit such words into writing is yet but too common.

Not only does written Bengali, as a rule, seek to supplant current Bengali words by their Sanskrit equivalents ; it keeps alive also the antiquated, obsolete forms of current words. These, having once obtained a recognised place in the language of writing, now refuse to be ousted from it. We call 'rice' *chál,* but write it *chául ; páthure* (stony) similarly becomes *páthuriyá* (*páthuriá*) and the *Node* of colloquial speech is *Nadiyá* (*Nodiá*) in writing. But I need not multiply instances. So numerous are such differences that an inveterate notion seems to have gained a firm hold of the Bengali national mind that the current form of a word is *not* its correct form.* I look upon this as a most unfortunate thing. The struggle with Sanskrit alone is no light affair, backed as Sanskrit must be with the entire bias of learning and wide-spread association ; and Sanskrit here has a potent ally in the obsolete forms of words rendered classical by Kabikankan, Krittibas, Kasi Das, and Bharatchandra.

The substitution of Sanskrit for current familiar words and of obsolete for current forms of a certain

* The *Iṅrdj* and *Inrdji* of writing, as against the *Iṅrej* and *Inrji* of speech, furnish a good instance of this.

class of words may both be included under the head of 'calling common things by uncommon names.' Most of our writers are fully under the sway of this supposed-purity-of-style fetish. It is amusing to contemplate the strange shifts to which even our best writers are driven to avoid current expressions. An illustration will show this best. A writer of deservedly very high reputation has recourse to উৎক্ষেপ করিয়া পুনর্ব্বার হস্তে গ্রহণ করা as a substitute for the common word লোপা. Can anything be more awkward than this?

The rage for Sanskrit vocables manifests itself in matters with which learning would seem to have little concern. On the license-plates of boats that ply in the river Hooghly, are to be seen *nábik* and *árohí* as the Bengali for 'crew' and 'passenger,' respectively; but none of the crew of any boat and not ninetynine-hundredths of the passengers have any notion of what the words *nábik* and *árohí* mean. Language has its many sides, and it is but reasonable that the carpenter, the boatman, and the shoemaker should give the law in matters connected with carpentry, boat-rowing and shoemaking, respectively; while in matters connected with science or scholarship, the scientist or the scholar should be the supreme arbiter. In Bengal, however, the Sanskrit-knowing Pandit has in a large measure assumed the function of determining the written language in *all* its aspects. The mental characteristics of the nation, and its historical antecedents have, of course, helped to bring about this unhappy result.

The present practice of borrowing from Sanskrit is based on no definite principle. Rational borrowing should seek only to supply a felt want. Where words are really wanting in Bengali, there must be borrowing. But such borrowing as has been above described is grounded on no necessity. No limit is set, in fact, to the extent to which words are to be borrowed from Sanskrit, so that every Sanskrit word is considered to have a rightful claim to be incorporated into Bengali. Is this to enrich the language, or to overburden it? This, indeed, is carrying us back into the past with a vengeance. In the early flexible stage of Sanskrit, when its formative powers were active, whole hosts of words were formed to express the same thing. Those words were then, as philologists hold, transparent attributive terms, and not the arbitrary symbols that they afterwards became. Men could not, indeed, be so irrational as to invent more than one arbitrary symbol for one and the same thing. Among the many significant symbols expressive of the same idea, there was a struggle for existence and a survival, in the long run, of the fittest. More symbols than one have in many cases survived; but on *à priori* grounds, it is quite impossible that more than one could survive at the same spot, and among the same class of people. Physical obstacles barring intercourse, or peculiarities of social organization limiting it, could alone cause different names to be used for the same thing. There would further arise a differentiation of meaning between

words that originally meant exactly the same thing. Our Sanskrit school of writers would, however, undo all this. They would bring back the dead to life. They would restore to Bengali, which is one of the modern developments of Sanskrit, all the imperfections of the mothertongue, that have been cast off for good. What a terrible legacy would a wholesale appropriation of the Sanskrit vocabulary leave to posterity? Men of capacity little think of the labour that the acquisition of a language costs; and of this labour the heaviest part is that required in mastering the vocabulary, which, consisting, as it does for the most part, of arbitrary symbols, is dull, dreary matter to learn. Where arbitrary symbols furnish a key to valuable knowledge, the symbols ought surely to be learnt. In the present case, however, the labour spent on the acquisition of words would be vain, meaningless labour. What is the good of learning a new word where one does not learn a corresponding new idea with it?* Perfection of language requires that no two words should express exactly the same idea, and that no two ideas should *have the same name. No human language is indeed* perfect like this, it is true. But this is no reason why

* This is to be taken with a certain limitation. The exigencies of rhythm, versification and artistic effect may make it desirable that there should be in a language more than one word to express the same thing. But all the words meaning the same thing that there may be in a language cannot be said to form in the same degree parts of the living tissue of the language. 'Billow,' for instance, is antique and 'the property of poets,' while 'wave' is the living word that is the property of all who speak English.

we should work the other way, and go on sanctioning and accumulating defects.

The example of other languages is quoted as a ground for maintaining, and even widening existing differences between spoken Bengali and written. No doubt there are numerous instances in other languages of 'calling common things by uncommon names.' This, however, cannot be looked upon as desirable on any account, and there is a visible tendency in English, at any rate, to assimilate closely the written to the spoken language. Dean Alford tells us that the tendency to 'call common things by uncommon names' varies inversely as the writer's culture , and a late professor of English at the Presidency College told his pupils in the lecture-room that in England, at the present day, the language spoken by the highest and best-educated has more in common with that of the lower orders than with that of men of inferior education. In taking a survey of the language of a country, the form of it peculiar to any large class of men, such as the men of inferior education in a community must form, is not, of course, to be left out of account. But the language of the class that stands highest in culture and social position is the standard to which the language of all sections of the community has a tendency to converge. The language of the highest and the most cultivated must be taken, then, as the normal standard of the language, and in the best English writers the tendency to 'call common things by uncommon names' must be at its

minimum. Indeed so far as the cultivated and the uncultivated go together, common sense should dictate that there should be community of language. If indeed the object were to confine knowledge to a caste, there could not be a cleverer contrivance than to make the written language diverge widely from the spoken. Such a contrivance would carry with it its own nemesis, however. Besides the unnecessary waste of brain-power implied in the acquisition of additional words without the acquisition of additional ideas, there must inevitably result a deterioration of the intellect, when it busies itself with mere word-knowledge.

In dealing with the question of the employment of Sanskrit words in Bengali writing, the Bengali graphic system cannot be left out of account. This system is nearly as bad as the English; it departs nearly as much from correct phonetic representation as the latter. This, however, is a wide question in itself, and need not here be further noticed than its direct bearing upon the Sanskrit element of book-Bengali demands. The Bengali pronunciation of Sanskrit is as monstrous as the English pronunciation of Latin;* and the Sanskrit words admitted into Bengali are thus, almost all of them, mispronounced, so that they are Sanskrit only to the eye, but none to the ear. This shows that the despised vernacular can, after a certain fashion, assert its rights against unjust encroachments. Let

* A reform has commenced in England in regard to Latin pronunciation.

us come now to illustrations. The current Bengali equivalents of 'fish' and 'sun' are *mách* (old Bengali *máchh*) and *shujji*, respectively. In writing, *mách* is made to give way to the Sanskrit *matsya* and *shujji* to to *suryya*; but instead of being pronounced as they are written, which, by the way would be their correct Sanskrit pronunciations, the two words are pronounced *matsho* and *surjjo* or *shurjo*, respectively. We acquire *mách* and *shujji* as a part of our mother-tongue, and the conventional necessity of having further to acquire their pseudo-Sanskrit equivalents *motsho* (written *matsya*) and *shurjjo* or *shurjo*, (written *suryya*), I, for one, must deplore as a most oppressive and unprofitable burden. There is another class of words which are wrongly accounted to be the same in Bengali as they are in Sanskrit. The Bengali and Sanskrit equivalents of 'south' and 'lord,' for instance, are written alike in both the languages; but, while in Bengali they are pronounced *dokkhin* and *ishshar*, respectively, in Sanskrit, as it is outside Bengal, they are written as well as pronounced, *dakshiṇa* and *íśvara*.

It is plain, then, that the so-called Sanskrit words in use in written Bengali are in fact neither Sanskrit nor Bengali, but monsters one knows not to call what. The unwise and indiscriminate transfer of Sanskrit words into Bengali has another bad effect little thought of. Certain sounds in Sanskrit are converted into certain other sounds in Bengali, according to definite phonetic laws; such as *s* into *sh*. These laws cannot

be transgressed. Mispronunciation of Sanskrit words introduced into Bengali is, therefore, a sort of necessity ; and this mispronunciation is imported back into Sanskrit when the Bengali learns that language. The correct pronunciation of Sanskrit, if enforced in our schools and colleges, would be a most effective check on the present practice of indiscriminate borrowing from Sanskrit. But on this point hereafter.

The points discussed, and the results arrived at, may here be summarised. The grammar of written Bengali differs considerably from the grammar of current Bengali. For familiar words understood by all, every one who learns to read has to learn Sanskrit substitutes, and in many cases old Bengali substitutes likewise, which, having dropped out of colloquial speech, still retain their place in the language of writing. The Sanskrit words in use in Bengali books are, for the most part, Sanskrit only to the eye, but none to the ear; for, though written just as they are in Sanskrit, they are pronounced in such a way as to make them almost unintelligible to those unfamiliar with the corrupt pronunciation of Sanskrit that prevails in Bengal.

All this, of course, has not been the work of a day. It has been the slow growth of ages. It has grown out of the mental characteristics, and the historical antecedents of the race. The question now is, whether the present is a state of things likely to endure. The conviction of the present writer is that a change of a radical character is inevitable. The desirability of a

change is indeed so patent, that it is really matter for wonder that the attachment to the established order of things is still so strong that Sir George Campbell's now historically famous language minutes evoked all but universal denunciation from Bengalis.

Bengali, in common with the other Indian vernaculars derived from Sanskrit, has borrowed most freely from the latter, under influences similar to those which have caused Arabic to be so largely drawn upon by Persians and Turks, and Latin and Greek by the nations of Western Europe. Sanskrit has been in India the language of literary culture and of religion. The Brahman priesthood have always affected the use of Sanskrit words in speech. Reverence for Sanskrit as a sacred language, however, will be a factor of continually decreasing importance as time rolls on. The Hindu religion in its prevailing form will inevitably break up before the onsets of Western science, and, with the Hindu religion in its prevailing form, will disappear a large part of the reverence now inspired by Sanskrit. It will ever command, however, another kind of reverence. Its absolute importance, as a language, and its rich literature, serving particularly as a key to the past history of the Aryan race, will ever make it a valued branch of learning. National feeling, too, will impel towards Sanskrit. In continuing to reverence Sanskrit, however, it is by no means necessary that we should, as at present, hold Bengali, Hindi, &c., in contempt. The tendency will certainly be to avail

ourselves as largely as possible of the living stores of our Bengali tongue, and not to unreasonably proscribe them as vulgar, because they are in use among all classes of the people. The entire Pandit class in Bengal at one time largely employed, in colloquial speech, numerous Sanskrit words in lieu of their Bengali equivalents. This is now going out of fashion. The language in which eminent Pandits like Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar and Taranath Tarkavachaspati converse differs in nowise from that of Bengali gentlemen possessing no knowledge of Sanskrit. Among Brahmans of the priestly class alone, does the garnishing of speech with Sanskrit words still linger in some measure, and the priests, as before remarked, are a gradually decaying class. The indications are quite clear, therefore, that the purely Sanskrit element in Bengali is destined to be greatly curtailed in future.

The arguments of the advocates of the present system of borrowing from Sanskrit demand an examination in detail. The main arguments are the following :—

1. The dialectic varieties of Bengali are so many and so conflicting, that without Sanskrit there would be no common standard of purity, no bond of union.

This argument has the fatal defect of proving too much. It proves that, without the purely Sanskrit element in Bengali, there would be no common language for Bengal. If this be the fact, then Bengal by all means should have several written languages instead of one. Convenience—human happiness—must be the plea

for cultivating the Bengali language at all. If, by ceasing to borrow, from Sanskrit, words of the commonest kind, we are to dissolve the linguistic unity of the people of Bengal, by all means let such factitious unity be dissolved at once. Popular education would spread better, and so human happiness would be better promoted, if the different sections of Bengal set up each its own dialect as the language of writing. The fact, however, is that there is a general grammatical correspondence among the different dialects of Bengal, and the vocables in common use, too, are in general the same all over the country. The provincial Bengali of the Malda, as of the Dacca and of the Bakarganj District, as spoken by men of the upper castes is quite intelligible to people in Calcutta, as the present writer can say from his own experience. Besides, the people of Bengal generally now look upon the metropolis and the districts lying along the Bhagirathi (Hooghly) as the parts where Bengali is spoken in its greatest purity.

In the development of literary languages, political capitals have in the past exercised but too much influence. Provincialisms have not been allowed fair play. They have but too frequently been kept out of the literary language, simply because they have been provincialisms. A better course than this would be to absorb into the cultivated dialect all that is of value in the several kindred dialects. Such absorption would be more real enrichment of a language than thoughtless borrowing under the bias of learning. If

this principle were admitted and acted upon, provincial peculiarities would, generally speaking, have a chance of being incorporated into the literary language, in proportion to the mental activity of the people who speak such dialects. Local centres of culture would thus have their due share of influence on the literary language of a country.

To turn again to Bengal. Supposing even that the Calcutta dialect were to thoroughly override all provincial dialects, there would be much less human unhappiness than under the present regime. On this supposition, the people within a certain radius of Calcutta, at any rate, would not have to learn new names for familiar things; and the people of the rest of Bengal would have to learn far fewer words than if Sanskrit were to be drawn upon, as now, without stint or limit. There would be nothing like the trouble now entailed on all Bengalis who learn to read and write.

If falling back upon the past be the best means of finding a common ground for all, the remoter this past the better. A revival of Sanskrit, grammar and all, would secure unity all over Aryan India, and not over Bengal alone. Why not seek to make a revived Sanskrit the language of the educated throughout Aryan India, and thus secure a united Indian nationality over this wide area? No one has been venturesome enough to propose such a thing. Besides the immeasurable difficulty that would attend such a revival of Sanskrit, a replacing of the handier vernaculars by

the cumbrous parent tongue would be decidedly a step backwards. A replacement of the comparatively handier Bengali words by their Sanskrit representatives would likewise be a step backwards, at the same time that it would demand a meaningless waste of brain-power from all Bengalis who learn to read and write.

2. Another argument urged by the advocates of a Sanskritised Bengali style is, that such borrowing has been quite spontaneous, and that this spontaneity must be taken as a proof that the course of development followed by the language could not, and should not change. To this, the answer would be that all that happens in the universe is in consequence of the operation of natural forces, and that things will change, as they have changed ere this, when other forces prevail over those that brought them into being. If borrowing from Sanskrit has been natural, the revulsion of feeling that such borrowing produces in the present writer and others among his countrymen is also natural, and the question can only be, which of the two opposing forces is likely to prove stronger in the end. This question has already been touched upon.

3. It has been urged again and again that Bengali, being a direct descendant of Sanskrit, has every right to borrow from the parent tongue, and that Sanskrit vocables more readily coalesce with the current vernacular tongue than do words from any other source.

As regards the first part of this assertion, it does not at all touch the position taken up by the present

writer. He does not denounce all borrowing. He further holds that in most cases Sanskrit would be the best source to borrow from, and his reasons will be given hereafter. It is the extent of such borrowing that forms the main point at issue between him and the advocates of the present regime. As stated already, he holds that borrowing should be limited by necessity.

As regards ready coalescence, people's notions about this have much to do with their own acquired mental associations. In the colloquial tongue, we find that English, Persian and Arabic vocables very readily unite with home-grown expressions, and one would think that what happens in the spoken ought to happen in the written language as well. Men's notions of *written style are, however, derived from books, and as* Bengali books, as a rule, eschew non-Sanskrit words, no wonder that the dogma should spring up that non-Sanskrit words will not readily coalesce with native Bengali. The best refutation of the dogma is the fact that English, Persian and Arabic words do mingle very kindly, in the current speech, with genuine Bengali words. The question, in what respects it would be preferable to borrow from Sanskrit rather than from any other source, will be discussed hereafter.

The discussion carried on by the press, when the world of Bengal was thrown into a ferment by Sir George Campbell's Bengali and Urdu minutes, betrayed in some instances a curious confusion that the writers made between words of Sanskrit derivation, and words

bodily transferred from Sanskrit. To words of the former class there can, of course, be no possible objection; those of the latter are open to many, and, as they appear to the present writer, insuperable objections.

4. It has been maintained, again, that, as book Bengali is intelligible to all Bengalis with the aid of a dictionary only, the question of the difference between book and spoken Bengali, is quite an immaterial one. *Intelligible with the aid of a dictionary only*—this involves most momentous issues. Every book in English would be similarly intelligible, with the aid of a dictionary, if for all the principal uninflected English words in the book, German equivalents were substituted. The sort of burden that the present practice of substituting Sanskrit equivalents for even the commonest Bengali words imposes on all who learn to read, has already been fully described, and need not, therefore, be here dwelt upon.

5. Lastly, it has been maintained that, whatever be the character of written Bengali at present, the State should not by any means interfere with its development. Languages grow spontaneously, and it does not rest with Cæsar, however absolute the power with which he is armed, to mould or modify it.

Fully admitting that language is an organic growth, and therefore not to be coerced into any shape at the fiat of authority, it may quite consistently be maintained that the present is a case which calls for State action. The *laissez faire* argument would have weight, if Government had never interfered in the matter at all.

It has, however, interfered in disseminating a knowledge of book Bengali by the establishment of schools, by the institution of competitive tests, by the award of scholarships, and so forth. Things have *not* been allowed to work themselves out spontaneously. Interference is necessary, at least, as a consequence of past interference still continued. Government, again, is not prepared to withdraw from the work of popular education ; and the interests of millions are involved in the question whether the medium of popular instruction is to be the real vernacular of the country, or the manufactured language in which books are at present generally written. The dumb millions cannot judge, or speak for themselves. If they could, they would, with one voice, denounce the pedantic jargon that now presses so heavily on them as a dead weight. Governments are most bound to look after the interests of those who cannot take care of their own interests. In a country, again, in the situation of India, the guidance of Government would, in several cases, be on the whole preferable to that of the 'natural leaders of society.' It is only because such lead has failed that the English are in the country at all. If, in respect of all that concerns the preservation of society and its advancement, English guidance has done for the natives of this country what they could not have, without such guidance, done for themselves,* the presumption

* It is not meant that English rule is without any drawbacks. Foreign rule must have its drawbacks.

ought to be that, in the matter of language, too, English guidance, with proper native co-operation, would be beneficial.

It must not be understood that in maintaining it to be the duty of Government to interfere in the matter under discussion, the present writer means any such thing that the Government should interdict the publication of any books in the present book-language. The great mass of Bengali readers do relish a Sanskritised Bengali style. The State should not curtail the happiness of such people by so unwarrantable an act of tyranny as putting their literary language under a ban. It is clearly the duty of the State, however, to take effective measures for the dissemination of useful knowledge among the people through the real vernacular of the people; and by the real vernacular is meant here the language in which the upper and middle classes of the Bengali community converse, and which the language of the lower orders also constantly tends to approach.

To recognise the real vernacular as the exclusive language of books intended for primary instruction would certainly not be to patronise a newly created language. It would amount only to an interdiction of any unnecessary Sanskrit infusion into the language of books intended to convey elementary knowledge. This, in the interests of the masses, the State is bound to do; and, for the rest, the struggle between the two styles may be left to be fought out between themselves.

Of the ultimate issue of such a struggle there can be no manner of doubt. If the fitter is to survive, then the cumbrous learned jargon can have no chance, in the long run, against the far more economical language that is now the current speech of Bengal.

The State may, further, do one thing more. It may take steps for making the European officers employed in Bengal thoroughly familiar with the current grammar and the current vocabulary of the Bengali tongue. As officers of Government, their utility would be greatly enhanced if they understood the language in which the people actually converse with one another.

A few words as to the way in which Sanskrit, in the present writer's opinion, can be legitimately drawn upon to enrich Bengali, may not here be out of place. The introduction of Western civilisation, and the spread of education has necessitated the addition of new words to the current stock of Bengali words. Should these words be adoptions or inventions from Sanskrit or adoptions from English? From the utilitarian, non-sentimental point of view, the fact that the latter course would inevitably stamp a mongrel character upon the language can have no weight. If there is real gain in borrowing from English, no purist feeling should be allowed to stand in the way. But the fact is that importations from English are liable to even graver objections than indiscriminate borrowing from Sanskrit. English words imported would be immensely more difficult for the people to learn than even lengthy

Sanskrit compounds invented on the occasion. If the principle of borrowing from English were to be fully accepted, there could be no stopping at words like 'oxygen,' for which there are no ready-made Sanskrit equivalents; but English equivalents of already-existing Sanskrit words would likewise be introduced into Bengali. This would cause much inconvenience and frightful confusion. A philosophical or scientific nomenclature framed out of Sanskrit can, as before observed, be mastered far more easily than the corresponding English nomenclature. Borrowing from English, therefore, would be an obstacle in the way of a spread of knowledge. An illustration would make my position better understood. The Bengali boy, who knows *kará* (to do), and the Hindustani boy who knows *karná*, can far more easily learn, the Sanskrit word *kriyá* than he can the English word 'verb' (from Latin *verbum*='word'), or the Arabic word *fi'l*. *Kará* and *kriyá* have so much in common as respects sound that there is much greater economy of mental effort in learning *kriyá* than in learning 'verb,' or *fi'l*. Take, again, such words as *gaṇit* (*gonit*) and *pâṭigaṇit* (*pâṭigonit*), their derivation from the same root as the Bengali *ganá* and the Hindi *ginná* would greatly help the memory. The corresponding English words 'mathematics' and 'arithmetic,' it would be much harder to remember. Some existing Sanskrit terms are, again, absolutely better than the corresponding ones in English. The Sanskrit *sarvanáma* is a more appropriate

term, as Professor Whitney* remarks, than the English term 'pronoun'; and Professor Max Müller† says of the grammatical terminology of the Brahmans generally, that it is 'in some respects more perfect than that of Alexandria and Rome.'

The existence of different philosophical and scientific nomenclatures would, again, help the advancement of thought. As observed by Dr. Mansel,‡ after Dugald Stewart, the possession by Germany of a philosophical nomenclature different from that of the English-speaking world and of the Latin world in Europe and America, has been a help to accurate thought. When India comes to take her proper place among the civilised community of nations, and contributes her share to the progress of human thought, her possession of an independent scientific§ and philosophical nomenclature would be a no insignificant force among the forces that urge forward humanity in the career of advancement.

While philosophical and scientific terms would seem to be best drawn from Sanskrit, a wide door should be left open for the introduction into writing of foreign

---

* *Language and the Study of Language*, 3rd Edition, p. 258.

† *Lectures on the Science of Language, First Series*, p. 104.

‡ *Prolegomena Logica*, Oxford Edition, 1851, p. 37.

§ [The view put forth here in regard to scientific terms, I modified long ago. I still hold that abstract terms used in science should be got from Sanskrit, but I think that names of material objects, such as 'oxygen' and 'acid'—except where such names exist ready-made in Sanskrit—should be taken from English and transliterated in accordance with the proper Latin sounds of the Roman characters. This would be a move in the direction of cosmopolitan solidarity.]

words, English or other, that under the pressure of necessity force their way into the current speech. It would be unreasonable purism to exclude from books such handy, naturalised words as 'map' and 'slate' (*shilet, shelet*), and to seek to supply their place by new-coined Sanskrit equivalents.

In the case of newly introduced material objects of common use, the direct adoption of foreign words in the spoken language would be the natural course, and the written language can here do no better than follow the spoken. The adoption of unusual foreign words, where accurate native or even Sanskrit equivalents cannot be found, would again be sometimes necessary. *Visva-vidyálaya* (in Bengali *bishshobidde²lae*) answers very inadequately to 'university' in its present acceptation. A downright adoption in writing of 'university' would be better than finding a substitute. In inventing words, again, with Sanskrit elements, it ought to be further borne in mind that the compounds formed should be handy ones, fit to be used colloquially. This has, in many instances, been lost sight of, and the tendency has been but too strong towards compounds, often lengthy, formed with unfamiliar materials.

An enforcement of the correct pronunciation of Sanskrit in our schools and colleges, very desirable on other grounds, would act as a powerful check upon reckless borrowing from Sanskrit. In enforcing correct Sanskrit pronunciation, Government would but complete the work it initiated by introducing into Bengal

the Devanagari character. Sanskrit books are now read in Bengal in the Devanagari character, and the incorrect pronunciation of Sanskrit that is allowed in all the Bengal schools and colleges, the Sanskrit College itself included, is an evil that calls loudly for remedy. The State has already innovated by introducing the Devanagari character. An enforcement of the correct Sanskrit pronunciation cannot, therefore, be objected to.

A word here about the large mass of Sanskrit words that popular poetry has already appropriated seems to be necessary. Such words have a right to be employed, where required, in poetry and impassioned prose; but in ordinary prose composition, they should be held inadmissible, for they form no part of the *living tissue* of the language. লড়াই and যুদ্ধ, are living words, while রণ, সমর, and সংগ্রাম, are antique and poetical.

In cultivating Bengali and the other Aryan vernaculars of India, the Romance languages of Europe should be our guide. There can be no reason why our vernaculars should lean more upon Sanskrit than such highly cultivated languages as French, Italian and Spanish do upon Latin.

APPENDIX.

I. Criticisms of the late Rai Bankimchandra Chatterjea, Bahadur, C.I.E., with comments on them.

(i) অনেক স্থলে তিনি কিছু বেশী গিয়াছেন। বহুবচন জ্ঞাপনে 'গণ' শব্দ ব্যবহার করার পক্ষে তাঁহার কোপদৃষ্টি। বাঙ্গালায় লিঙ্গভেদ তিনি মানেন না। 'পৃথিবী' যে বাঙ্গালায় স্ত্রীলিঙ্গবাচক শব্দ ইহা তাঁহার চক্ষুঃশূল। বাঙ্গালায় তিনি 'জনৈক' লিখিতে দিবেন না। ত্ব-প্রত্যয়ান্ত এবং য-প্রত্যয়ান্ত শব্দ ব্যবহার করিতে দিবেন না। সংস্কৃত সংখ্যাবাচক শব্দ, যথা—একাদশ বা চত্বারিংশৎ বা দুই শত ইত্যাদি বাঙ্গালায় ব্যবহার করিতে দিবেন না। ভ্রাতা, কলা, কর্ণ, স্বর্ণ, তাম্র, পত্র, মস্তক, অশ্ব ইত্যাদি শব্দ বাঙ্গালা ভাষায় ব্যবহার করিতে দিবেন না। ভাই, কাল, কান, সোণা, কেবল এই সকল শব্দ ব্যবহার হইবে। এইরূপ তিনি বাঙ্গালা ভাষার উপর অনেক দৌরাত্ম্য করিয়াছেন। তথাপি তিনি এই প্রবন্ধে বাঙ্গালাভাষা-সম্বন্ধে অনেক গুলিন সার-গর্ভ কথা বলিয়াছেন। বাঙ্গালা লেখকেরা তাহা স্মরণ রাখেন, ইহা আমাদের ইচ্ছা। Collected works, Vol. II., p. 759.

(1) What is said here against some of my positions is simply an *argumentum ad verecundiam*, *i.e.*, an appeal to the reader's feeling of reverence, here for a particular time-hallowed established order of things. My arguments remain untouched, and they hardly require any strengthening, so far as I can see. I have only the following observations to make. The grammatical feminine imported from Sanskrit is supported here. But in the চতুর্থ সংস্করণের বিজ্ঞাপন prefixed to his রাজসিংহ, Bankimchandra himself renounces the imported vocative case thus:— আমি যদিও ইতিপূর্ব্বে সম্বোধনে "ভগবন,"

"প্রভো," "স্বামিন," "রাজকুমারি," "পিতঃ" প্রভৃতি লিখিয়াছি, এক্ষণে এ সকল বাঙ্গালা ভাষায় অপ্রযোজ্য বলিয়া পরিত্যাগ করিয়াছি। Why the Sanskrit vocative forms should be অপ্রযোজ্য in Bengali and the no less alien and no less troublesome Sanskrit grammatical feminines should not be such, I fail to comprehend. Whatever reasons can be urged against the former, can, with equal force, be urged against the latter.—(2) It is certainly not fair to say of me, "ত্ব-প্রত্যয়ান্ত এবং য-প্রত্যয়ান্ত শব্দ ব্যবহার করিতে দিবেন না", because, as an advocate of phonetic spelling, I object to the representation of the *tto*-sound (which I recognise as the specific Bengali abstract suffix) by ত্ব, and because I suggest that "in respect of new importations [of abstract terms from Sanskrit], it would be best perhaps, if they could be restricted to abstract terms in *tá.*"—(3) The practice of borrowing numerals from Sanskrit *ad libitum* has landed us upon such monstrous Bengali as অষ্টষষ্ট্যধিকশততম সংস্করণ for এক-শ-আটষট্টি বারের সংস্করণ (better প্রকাশ, instead of সংস্করণ). Sanskrit numerals up to চতুর্দ্দশ at most can be said to have been naturalised in Bengali, the feminine forms up to চতুর্দ্দশী being current all over Bengal.—(4) Bankimchandra has called some of my proposals for ridding literary Bengali of its burden of unneeded Sanskrit words দৌরাত্ম্য towards বাঙ্গালাভাষা. By বাঙ্গালাভাষা Bankimchandra expressly means লিখিবার ভাষা. But he has hardly stuck to it. To the Bengali language, as written, he has himself, by the way, rendered the signal service of breaking down its fence of purism. But though he

used, on occasions that appeared to him suitable, any word that came handy, without minding its pedigree, he acted on the principle of compromise, and kept his diction, generally speaking, up to the usual literary standard. From his point of view, therefore, the innovations I proposed could not but appear to be acts of violence towards the Bengali language as written. I have here a good retort to make by pointing to what is unquestionably an act of violence which he and other well-known Bengali authors have committed towards Bengali as spoken, by employing in conversational passages, not only the grammatical forms of a by-gone age, but by putting Sanskrit words into the mouths of people who could never have used them. Vidyasagar Mahasay, in his বর্ণপরিচয়, দ্বিতীয় ভাগ, makes his রাখাল say, "প্রভু, রাগ করিবেন" ; Bankimchandra, in his রাজসিংহ, makes his রাণা রাজসিংহ say, "আমরা একশত যোদ্ধা মাত্র ; মোগলের সঙ্গে দুই হাজার—আমরা রণ করিয়া প্রাণত্যাগ করিতে পারি, কিন্তু জয়ী হইতে পারিব না" ; Babu Chunder Nath Bose, in his latest work, gives the following as the words he heard uttered by a Calcutta girl :—"রাত্রের রুটি ছিল, আর আজ সকালে শাকভাজা হইয়াছিল তাহাই খাইয়াছি". Letting alone the obsolete grammatical forms in the above passages, where is the রাখাল in Bengal who would speak of his মনিব as his প্রভু ; where the Bengali who would use in speech এক শত instead of এক শ, and রণ instead of লড়াই or যুদ্ধ ; and where the Calcutta girl who would use রাত্রের instead of রাত্তিরের; and শাক instead of শাগ ? In justification of the use, by writers,

of obsolete grammatical forms and unneeded Sanskrit words, in their narrative style, it may be urged that they only adhere to the standard literary Bengali. But there can be no such justification in the case of the language of converation. It cannot be urged that the interlocutors are made to speak as Bengali people of any class do speak. Obsolete grammatical forms and Sanskritised diction do but make the conversational Bengali in which they occur an *unreality*. The great poet Madhusudan introduced no obsolete grammatical forms into his নাটক.

(ii) তিনি বলেন যে রূপান্তরিত প্রচলিত সংস্কৃতমূলক শব্দের পরিবর্ত্তে কোন স্থলেই অরূপান্তরিত মূল সংস্কৃত শব্দ ব্যবহার করা কর্ত্তব্য নহে, যথা—মাথার পরিবর্ত্তে মস্তক, বামণের পরিবর্ত্তে ব্রাহ্মণ ইত্যাদি ব্যবহার করা কর্ত্তব্য নহে। আমরা বলি যে এক্ষণে বামণ যেরূপ প্রচলিত, ব্রাহ্মণ সেইরূপ প্রচলিত। পাতাও যেরূপ প্রচলিত, পত্র ততদূর না হউক, প্রায় সেইরূপ প্রচলিত। ভাই যেরূপ প্রচলিত, ভ্রাতা ততদূর না হউক, প্রায় সেইরূপ প্রচলিত। যাহা প্রচলিত হইয়াছে তাহার উচ্ছেদে কোন ফল নাই; এবং উচ্ছেদ সম্ভবও নহে। কেহ যত্ন করিয়া মাতা, পিতা, ভ্রাতা, গৃহ, তাম্র, বা মস্তক ইত্যাদি শব্দকে বাঙ্গালা ভাষা হইতে বহিষ্কৃত করিতে পারিবেন না। আর বহিষ্কৃত করিয়া বা ফল কি? এ বাঙ্গালা দেশে কোন চাষা আছে যে, ধান্য, পুষ্করিণী, গৃহ বা মস্তক ইত্যাদি শব্দের অর্থ বুঝে না? যদি সকলে বুঝে, তবে কি দোষে এই শ্রেণীর শব্দগুলি বধার্হ? বরং ইহাদের পরিত্যাগে ভাষা কিয়দংশে ধনশূন্য* হইবে মাত্র। নিষ্কারণ ভাষাকে ধনশূন্যা* করা কোনক্রমে বাঞ্ছনীয় নহে। Collected works, Vol. II, p. 759.

(1) বামণ, ব্রাহ্মণ, পিতা, মাতা and পুষ্করিণী are not

* Cannot ধনশূন্য, evidently a misprint here for ধনশূন্যা, do better in Bengali than the latter?

among the words mentioned by me. It cannot be fair to attribute to me what I did not say, and had not in my mind either. I know full well that ব্রাহ্মণ, with its approved Bengali sound of *brámmhan* (of which *brámbhon* is a popular variant), is a current word in the language. I could, therefore, never think of proscribing the use of the word in writing. *Báman* or *bámon* is not current in the tract of country (Calcutta included) with which I am familiar. The term current is *bámun*. *Báman*, *bámon*, *bámun* appear to be the several steps of the change. পিতা is a word used orally, though but rarely; and if মাতা is not used colloquially by itself, it is used in combination with পিতা in পিতামাতা, and also with the prefix বি in বিমাতা. পুষ্করিণী is not currently spoken as it is written; but *pushkorni* and *pushkonni* are current Bangali words, side by side with the shorter and more common word *pukur*.—(2) পাতা যেরূপ প্রচলিত, পত্র .....প্রচলিত। ভাই যেরূপ প্রচলিত, ভ্রাতা······প্রচলিত। This seems to me intelligible only if by বাঙ্গালা ভাষা we understand the spoken and written language taken together, for I do not know if any body in conversation ever uses পত্র for 'leaf,' or ভ্রাতা for 'brother.' Specifically, পত্র, in the sense of 'leaf,' is used in compounds that have some connection with religion, as in বিল্বপত্র (in popular Bengali, *billi-pattor*) and in ভূর্জ্জপত্র (in popular Bengali, *bhujji-pattor*, which corresponds to the Hindi *bhoj-pattar*). পত্র in the sense of 'letter' or 'document' is a good deal used, its sound changing to *pattor*, as in *chiṭi-pattor* and

kágaj-pattor. I do not see what definite quantitative meaning can be attached to 'প্রায়' in 'প্রায় সেইরূপ প্রচলিত' in the foregoing extract.—(3) যাহা প্রচলিত হইয়াছে, তাহার উচ্ছেদে কোন ফল নাই এবং উচ্ছেদ সম্ভব ও নহে। These two general propositions, if applied to all sorts of prevailing practices, would be too absurd to require any refutation. They have to be taken, therefore, as meant to be applicable to the special case under consideration. Let us see if they fitly apply to it. ভ্রাতা, গৃহ, তাম্র, মস্তক, ধান্য &c. came to be made প্রচলিত in written Bengali by writers whose creed it was that the corresponding vernacular words were unworthy of being introduced into writing. They have, however, not only not been able to drive the latter out of the spoken tongue but have failed to obtain for themselves a place in it. Through the operation of natural forces, ভ্রাতা, গৃহ, তাম্র, মস্তক and ধান্য have been simplified for us into ভাই, ঘর, তামা or তাঁবা, মাথা or মাতা and ধান. Would it not be a gain if the shorter words drove their lengthier ancient representatives out of writing, as they have driven them out of speech? ঘটিকা, in phrases like ৫ ঘটিকার সময় for ৫টার সময়, only cumbers the written language, in which it has been made প্রচলিত.

A word that is actually used in speech by a people or by any section of a people does beyond question belong to the language of that people. This is more than can be said of every word that enters into a language as written, particularly into a language like literary Bengali, which has long been under the heels

of a Sanskritising class of writers. If a Vidyasagar writes দ্রাক্ষা for আঙুর, ঘরট্ট for যাঁতা, ভাটক for ভাড়া and মলিম্লুচ for চোর; if an Akkhay Kumar writes অর্ণবপোত for জাহাজ and লৌহবর্ত্ম for রেলওয়ে; if a Madhusudan writes হর্য্যক্ষ for সিংহ and ত্বিষাম্পতি for সূর্য্য; if a Bhudeb writes কফোণি for কনুই and মণিবন্ধ for কবজী; if a Bankim writes গুম্ফশ্মশ্রু for গোঁপদাড়ী* and পণ্যবীথিকা for সারি সারি দোকান—the words, some of them very formidable ones, by the way, do not straightway become Bengali words, but remain, after all, as aliens among the living words of the Bengali tongue. If any of them ever come to be used in *speech* by the Bengali people or by any section of the Bengali people, which is by no means likely to be the case, can it claim to be a genuine Bengali word. It is otherwise, however, with words borrowed from Sanskrit or formed with Sanskrit elements—that supply a real need. গণিত, বিজ্ঞান, মাধ্যাকর্ষণ, ভূতত্ত্ব, মূলতত্ত্ব, আবিষ্কার, পরার্থপরতা and হিতবাদ, for instance, at once become Bengali. Supplying real wants in the language, they show themselves equally fit to be employed in writing and in speech. The real test of naturalisation for a word is the being used in speech; and this test, words like those just mentioned stand very well, but words of the ঘরট্ট and হর্য্যক্ষ class utterly fail to stand. যাহা প্রচলিত হইয়াছে তাহার উচ্ছেদ সম্ভবও

---

* Words like দাড়ী, গাড়ী, রুটী are now generally written with ি in the final syllable, although, according to both sound and derivation from Hindi they should be written with ী. The Bengali ি is hardly ever as short as the Devanagari ि.

নহে :—This is a proposition, which a single instance of a contradictory character suffices to overthrow. The word দস্তখত furnishes such an instance. At one time, within living memory, this word was in general use, and its rival, স্বাক্ষর, which has now almost entirely, if not entirely, driven it out of the field, was not in use at all. I would give two more instances.

The living Bengali word for 'ship' is জাহাজ (*jāhāj*), which is the Arabic *jahāz* as naturalised in Bengali. The presence of this word *jāhāj* in the Bengali language makes it quite unnecessary to borrow a Sanskrit substitute for it. Under the puristic impulse which dominated the mind of a great Bengali writer, the late Mr. Akkhay Kumar Datta, অর্ণবপোত (*arnabapot*), came to be the literary substitute for জাহাজ in Bengali writing. I have met with the word অর্ণবপোত in the writing of a recent writer. This is no proof, however, of the word জাহাজ being ousted out of Bengali by অর্ণবপোত, which has taken no place yet in the spoken language of Bengal. The spoken form of a language is its living form, and borrowers from Sanskrit into Bengali without necessity should remember that the words they borrow cannot claim to be Bengali by merely getting a place in written Bengali. No word is a true Bengali word which is not used or fit to be used in Bengali speech. The test of naturalization of a foreign word in a language is its capacity for incorporation in the language as it is spoken, and so no borrowed word which cannot bear this test can be

counted a constituent part of the language. The two-syllabled Persian *dúrbín*, naturalised in Bengali, has been transformed by purists into the four-syllabled দূরবীক্ষণ (*durobikkhan*). Where is the *impossibility* then of words, which have come to be regarded as dignified or elegant under one set of influences, coming to be regarded as pedantic under another set of influences? Bankimchandra's is not the antiquated view that the modern developments of classical Sanskrit words are *corruptions* which should be avoided in writing. But it is not his view either that the so-called corruptions are in reality simplifications effected under the law of 'least action'—of least expenditure of energy. Sanskrit itself bears evidence of such simplification. स्वर्ण (*svarna*) is evidently a simplification of सुवर्ण (*suvarna*). By dealing its death-blow to purism, Bankimchandra himself has proved how much the individual initiative of a writer of great power can do to break down a prevailing (প্রচলিত) practice. If in future a prose writer of equal or greater power, imbued with the idea that the Bengali modifications of Sanskrit words are really simplifications, and also with the idea that borrowing from Sanskrit should be limited to actual necessity, wrote on set purpose not to employ a single Sanskrit word unnecessarily, the literary language of Bengal could not fail to be revolutionised more markedly than Bankimchandra has revolutionised it. —(4) এ বাঙ্গালা দেশে কোন চাষা আছে......বুঝে না। That ধান্য, গৃহ and মস্তক are understood by every Bengali

peasant, in the sense that he understands the words as soon as he hears them uttered, is certainly not a fact. The statement is correct only in the sense that, as soon as he is told that ধান্য is the same as ধান, গৃহ the same as ঘর, and মস্তক the same as মাথা or মাতা, he at once recognises the identity in each case. Besides identification, there would also be the necessity of remembering the words ধান্য, গৃহ and মস্তক, if they have, as at present, equal currency with ধান, ঘর and মাথা in books of even the most elementary character. This remembering must cost an appreciable mental effort. Where the Sanskrit word has no radical affinity with the word in current use, as অশ্ব has none with ঘোড়া, there can be no identification, and the mental effort needed in acquiring the Sanskrit woid would be the same as what would be needed in acquiring an English or a French word, 'horse' or 'cheval,' for instance. Indeed the mental effort needed in acquiring the Sanskrit equivalents of common Bengali words that have now to be acquired, would suffice for the acquisition of the corresponding words of the two leading foreign languages, English and French. It would be a clear gain to a Bengali child not to have to learn words like ধান্য and অশ্ব, at the primary stage, at any rate,—not to waste upon the acquisition of a superfluity of words, his powers and his time, which could be far more profitably employed upon the acquisition of a knowledge of things. It would have been best also if Bengali children, on passing beyond the primary stage, could

have avoided learning words like ধান্য and অশ্ব, and if such of them as had later to learn Sanskrit could have learnt धान्य (*dhánya*) and अश्व (*aśva*) at once, without having had to learn ধান্য (*dhánno*) and অশ্ব (*ashsho*), as bewildering intermediaries between ধান (*dhán*) and धान्य (*dhánya*) and between ঘোড়া (*ghorá*) and अश्व (*aśva*). But as matters stand, this is not possible ; for, the many, who, after passing the primary stage, must avail themselves of the works of value that already exist in the Bengali language, the learning of words like ধান্য and অশ্ব would be a necessity. The most rational course, it seems, would be that such words should be learnt with a distinct recognition of their being pseudo-Sanskrit words, used in writing, but forming no part of the working vocabulary* of Bengali speech. Some mark of distinction between these two classes of words is a *desideratum* in Bengali dictionaries, words appropriated from Sanskrit which supply real wants in the language being included in the latter class.—(5) Bankimchandra's theory that words like ভ্রাতা, ধান্য, মস্তক and গৃহ add to the wealth of the Bengali language can rest only on the ground that they lend themselves to the formation of compounds with words following them, which words like ভাই, ধান, মাথা and ঘর, generally do not ; for, used by themselves, ভ্রাতা, ধান্য, মস্তক and গৃহ, can serve no purpose that could

* Words distinctively belonging to Musalmani Bengali, such as পানী and চাচা, should be recognised as forming part of the working vocabulary of the Bengali tongue.

not be better served by ভাই, ধান, মাথা and ঘর, respectively. In fact, he says that ভ্রাতৃভাব and ভ্রাতৃত্ব being desirable words in the Bengali language, it is desirable to retain ভ্রাতা in the language. But ভ্রাতা is not the same as ভ্রাতৃ; and, if it is granted that it is desirable to have ভ্রাতৃভাব and ভ্রাতৃত্ব in Bengali, it by no means follows that we should also have ভ্রাতা as a rival to ভাই. English has 'fraternity,' 'fraternal,' and 'fraternise,' without having *frater*; and, what is more to the point, French has *'fraternité,' 'fraternel,'* and *'fraterniser,'* without having *frater*, side by side with *'frère.'* If the development of modern languages, descended, mostly collaterally, from cultivated classical languages, had taken the same course as that of the latter had taken, then *'frère'* itself would have yielded derivatives, instead of derivatives being formed from *frater*, and ভাইভাব and ভাইত্ব (on the analogy of *ginnotto* from *ginni*) would not have appeared awkward, as, under present circumstances, they are bound to appear. Certain Sanskrit compounds and derivatives are certainly needful additions to the Bengali language; but there are others which unnecessarily burden it, some giving rise even to faulty thought. Sanskrit compounds and derivatives gratify the Bengali people's love of sonority, which seems to have acquired its present enormous power over, not only the Bengali, but the entire Hindu mind, in consequence of all sorts of works in Sanskrit being composed in verse. The love of sonority—the love of rhetoric—is the great

secret of high-sounding Sanskrit words, simple and compound, being such great favourites with Bengali writers and readers. The compounds in 'বহিষ্কৃত করিয়া দেওয়া' and 'পুরাতন পুস্তকালয়' are instances of faulty language involving faulty thought. বহিষ্কৃত করা, as being equal to বাহির-করা করা, covers a pleonasm ; পুরাতন পুস্তকালয় means an old book-shop, and not, what it is meant to express, a shop for the sale of old books. It is the Bengali love of sonority that causes the simplest ideas being clothed in figurative and high-sounding language. "Observing that the sun was about to set," becomes in the literary Bengali of the approved type " দিনমণি অস্তাচলে গমনোদ্যোগী দেখিয়া,"* which literally translated into English, would be, "observing the gem-of-day exerting [himself] for proceeding to the setting-immobile" [immobile=mountain]. There may be occasions on which the sun (সূর্য্য) may well be figuratively called 'the gem of day' (দিনমণি), and a mountain (পাহাড় or পর্ব্বত) 'the immobile' (অচল) ; but the speaking of a common, everyday phenomenon is hardly such an occasion. Then, again, the idea of the sun setting behind the Western Mountains, which perhaps originated in the olden time in the Panjab, where people saw the sun sinking behind the Sulaiman Mountains, is hardly a suitable one for Bengal, where people do not

* দুর্গেশনন্দিনী, ১ম খণ্ড, ১ম পরিচ্ছেদ, ২য় বাক্য। 'The Chieftain's Daughter' is the received English version of দুর্গেশনন্দিনী. But the latter is an expression so antique and poetical that it is not closely translatable into a literary language like English, which has to bear the storm and stress of life.

see the sun sinking behind any mountain-range. So great is the Bengali love of rhetoric that Bankinchandra, with all his rich mental gifts, could not have obtained the hearing that he did obtain, if he had not written in part in a highly Sanskritised style. The prevailing taste would have been a bar in his way.

Agreeableness of sound must ever rank as a valued quality of style ; but brevity, precision, lucidity and impressiveness are higher qualities than agreeableness of sound. Rhetoric is still too much valued even in the most advanced countries of the West, but it is getting to be less and less valued. Hobbes said long ago, "Words are wise men's counters, they do but reckon by them ; but they are the money of fools." Sir Henry Sumner Maine has recently put forth the following estimate of rhetoric :—"The differences which after ages of change, separate the civilised man from the savage or barbarian are not so great as the vulgar opinion would have them. Man has changed much in Western Europe, but it is singular how much of the savage there is still in him....Like the savage the Englishman, Frenchman or American makes war ; like the savage he hunts ; like the savage he dances ; like the savage he indulges in endless deliberation ; like the savage he sets an extravagant value on rhetoric...."* If love of rhetoric is a marked quality of the Bengali national mind, there is in it another marked quality, that is of a directly antagonistic

* *Popular Government*, 3rd Edition, p. 144.

character. This is the strength of the logical faculty and of the mathematical, which is allied to the logical. For ages have students from other parts of India come to Nadia, in Bengal, for the study of *Nyáya* (Hindu Logic). It is, therefore, but reasonable to hope that the naturally strong logical faculty of the Bengali mind, reinforced, as it continuously must be, by scientific knowledge and scientific training, will ultimately overpower the Bengali love of rhetoric, and thus sweep away the prevailing practice of 'clothing thin ideas in well-made garments,' to quote a phrase of Mr. Frederic Harrison's.

Bankimchandra mentions জল, মেঘ, and সূর্য্য as words whose forms have not changed (রূপান্তরিত হয় নাই) from what they are in Sanskrit (p. 759). If their forms have not changed *i.e.*, if their spelling remains unchanged, their sounds have certainly changed. জল is *jal* (the *a* being long), while जल is *jala* (the *a's* being short), মেঘ (simplified into *meg* in current Bengali) is *megh*, while मेघ is *megha* now, and was *maigha* originally ; সূর্য্য is *shurjjo* or *shurjo*, while सूर्य्य is *súryya*. Regarding *surjjo* and *shujji*, it has to be observed that as noblemen, gentlemen (Pandits included) and men belonging to the lower grades of society—all called the late Dr. Soorjee Coomar Sarbadhikari, Rai Bahadur, "*Shujji Bábu*," the word *shujji* cannot be denounced as vulgar.

Writing a word just as it is in Sanskrit does not, after all, ensure its being pronounced as it is in Sanskrit.

Other changes of sound apart, the inherent *a* of consonants at the end of Sanskrit words—as also in the middle when its expulsion can effect the saving of a syllable, except when the consonants happen to be represented by conjunct characters—refuses to transfer itself to Bengali, as it does also to Hindi without any exception.

Thus it is that the so-called Sanskrit words in Bengali are in fact almost entirely pseudo-Sanskrit. Writers in Bengali, by appropriating words from Sanskrit, have only succeeded in bringing into existence what is really a Prakrit vocabulary based upon the Sanskrit vocabulary as *written*, while the Bengali Neo-Prakrit vocabulary has sprung from an older Prakrit (the Magadhi, as competent scholars declare) as *spoken*. The following list of words will show how the vernacular Bengali tongue has been potent enough to compel words, written in Bengali as they are written in Sanskrit, to approach in sound the corresponding words in popular use. In the list each word is first given as written in Bengali character; then follow, in succession, in Italic character, transliteration (the inherent *a*, where aborted, being unrepresented), phonetic transcription, and, finally, phonetic representation of the corresponding Bengali word :—আহ্লাদ, *áhlád*, *állhád*, *állád* ; কন্যা, *kanyá*, *konne*[2], *konne* ; দুঃখ, *duhkha*, *dukkha*, *dukkhu* ; ভাদ্র, *bhádra*, *bháddro*, *bháddor* ; মিথ্যা, *mithyá*, *mitthe*[2], *mitthe* ; সত্য, *satya*, *shotto*, *shotti* ; বিক্রয়, *bikray* (s, *vikraya*), *bikkrae*, *bikkiri* ; বিদ্যা, *bidyá* (s. *vidyá*), *bidde*[2], *bidde* ; বৈদ্য, *baidya* (s. *vaidya*), *boiddo*,

boddi ; রাত্রি, *rátri*, *ráttri*, *ráttir.** In the case of the words সত্য, বিক্রম, and বৈদ্য, it has to be pointed out that the final i-sound of the corresponding words in popular use, is nearer to the original final diphthong, *ya* (=*ia*), than the final *o* or *e* of the pseudo-Sanskrit variations.

If Sanskrit spelling is to be maintained to the utmost extent possible, not only in respect of words drawn bodily from Sanskrit, but also in respect of words derived from Sanskrit, such as সোণা and চূণ, spelt with ণ instead of ন, in slavish submission to the spelling of স্বর্ণ and চূর্ণ, and in utter disregard of sound, why should not words from Persian and Arabic, highly cultivated languages to which our Musalman fellow countrymen owe allegiance, be accorded the same privilege, which has, in fact, been partially accorded to certain English words, such as 'street' and 'school'† ?

---

* The nexus system of writing appears to be responsible for the doubling of the sound of a non-initial consonant when it forms a conjunct character with य or र following. सत्य is admittedly—सत्+य. रात्रि, though held to be—रा+त्रि, seems to have been sounded as रात्+रि. The Hindi रात and the Bengali রাত seem to show that when these words were formed from रात्रि, this word was pronounced as *rat-ri* and not as *ra-tri*. The original sound of सत्य must have been *sat-ya*, and not *sa-tya*, which is the proper sound of the written word. *Sat-tya* is a compromise between *sat-ya* and *sa-tya*. Similarly *rat-tri* is a compromise between *rat-ri* and *ra-tri*. Conjunct characters give rise to absurd syllabification. पूर्णचन्द्र, for instance, would be syllabified as *pū-rṇa-cha-ndra*, instead of *pūr-ṇa-chan-dra*.

† Street is written ষ্ট্রীট in Bengali, and school is written স্কুল or স্কুল. They are not written ইষ্টিরিট (ইষ্-টি-রিট) and ইস্কুল (ইস্-কুল), respectively, as Bengali organs of speech have made them.

Why should not গোলাপ be written গুলাব ; খারাপ, খরাব ; জিনিস or জিনিষ, জিন্‌স্ ; দোকান, দূকান , তামাসা, তমাষা ; খরচ, খর্চ্ ; সক, যৌক ; তফাৎ or তফাত, তফাবুত or তফাউত ; মফঃস্বল or মফস্বল, মুফস্সল (মু-ফস্-সল) ; জমিদার, জমিনদার ; সেরেস্তা, সররিষতঃ (সর-রিষ-তঃ) ; জুলুম, জুল্ম্ ; খুন, খূন ; বদমাইস, বদমাষ ; গোমস্তা, গুমাষতা (গু-মাষ-তা) ; আদালৎ or আদালত, অদালত ; মকদ্দমা (otherwise variously spelt মোকদ্দমা, মকর্দ্দমা, মোকর্দ্দমা), মুকদ্দমা ; গ্রেপ্তার, গিরিফতার ; সোপর্দ্দ স্থপুর্দ্ ; হেফাজত, হিফাজত ; ক্রোক or কোরক, কুর্ক্ ; বাহাদুর, বহাদুর * ; and so forth. The widest liberty is taken in the spelling of words from Persian and Arabic, while it is held to be a mortal sin to' depart from Sanskrit spelling in any way. So far has this Sanskrit worship been carried that, in one of two very good approved elementary text-books, the word সিন্দুক (from Arabic *sandúq*) is spelt সিন্ধুক and so brought into line with সিন্ধু, and in the other রুজু (from Arabic *rujú*= turning towards) is turned into ঋজু, ঋজু জানালা being used in the sense of a জানালা which is রুজু-রুজু to another. মকদ্দমা রুজু করা may as well be turned into মকদ্দমা ঋজু করা ।

Bankimchandra has said, and it is an oft-repeated assertion, that the language of writing must ever remain different from the language of speaking. This point has been touched upon in my essay. I would here reinforce what I have said with the following remarks :—(1) Does the language of mathematics and

---

* In the transliterated forms of the original words, I use ষ for the Arabic and Persian letter *shin*, as the proper sound of this letter is that of the Devanagari ष, for which stands the Bengali ষ. The English sh is oftener equivalent to ष than to श.

science, in English, for instance, present a different phase in writing from what it does in speaking? Does not the writer of a treatise on mathematics or science use precisely the same kind of language as a professor lecturing orally on either of these subjects does? Should not the language of mathematics and science be our most valued models, as leaving absolutely no room for superfluity of words and ornate rhetoric? Should we not first settle what our matter of fact style should be before we think of what are called the graces of style—settle 'the useful' before we think of 'the ornamental,' which, by the way, has also its use, though in a subordinate way? It is true that, while some writers have mainly to address the understanding, others have mainly to move the feelings, and others again have simply to amuse. There must, therefore, be different styles to suit these different purposes. But even in moving the feelings and in amusing, training in the precision of style that mathematics and science can teach cannot fail to be of great service, though certain devices, that are hardly needful in mathematics or science, would be needed. The writer or public speaker who uses the fewest, the aptest, and the most familiar words to enforce his arguments or to appeal to the feelings of his reader or hearer, is the most effective writer or speaker.—(2) That some difference there must be between the language of writing and the language of speaking being admitted, would it not be a gain if this difference were as small as possible?

—(3) Men's ideas of what is good style and what is bad, is very much a matter of association. But association here is not of the indissoluble kind. If Johnsonese is in fashion at one time, it may go out of fashion in another, being then considered stilted and unnatural.—(4) Mr. Frederic Harrison in his article, "On Style in English Prose," in the *Nineteenth Century* for June 1898, has the following :—"Supposing one has something to say—something that it concerns the world to know........—all I have to tell him is this. Think it out clearly in your mind, and put it down in the simplest words that offer, just as if you were telling it to a friend, but dropping the tags of the day, with which your spoken discourse is likely to be garnished." The French now write as they speak : so said Dr. Nisikanta Chattopadhyay, who had been in France, in the course of a public address he gave in Calcutta some years ago ; and what he said finds support in the French saying, "All peasants have style," mentioned by Mr. Frederic Harrison in his article referred to above. In the two foremost living languages of the world, then, there is a tendency at present to approximate closely the language of writing to the language of speaking.

(iii) The following passages from Bankimchandra's article should command the respectful attention of Bengali writers and readers. (1) অকারণে মাথার পরিবর্ত্তে মস্তক, অকারণে পাতার পরিবর্ত্তে পত্র এবং তামার পরিবর্ত্তে তাম্র ব্যবহার করা উচিত নয়। কেন না, ঘর, মাথা, পাতা, তামা বাঙ্গালা, আর গৃহ, মস্তক, পত্র, তাম্র সংস্কৃত। বাঙ্গালা লিখিতে গিয়া অকারণে

বাঙ্গালা ছাড়িয়া সংস্কৃত কেন লিখিব ? (2) যে সকল শব্দ সংস্কৃতের সহিত সম্বন্ধশূন্য শ্যামাচরণ বাবু যাহা বলিয়াছেন তাহা অত্যন্ত সারগর্ভ এবং আমরা তাহার সম্পূর্ণ অনুমোদন করি। সংস্কৃতপ্রিয় লেখকদিগের অভ্যাস যে, এই শ্রেণীর শব্দ সকল তাঁহারা রচনা হইতে একেবারে বাহির করিয়া দেন। অন্যের রচনায় সে সকল শব্দের ব্যবহার শেলের ন্যায় তাঁহাদিগকে বিদ্ধ করে। (3) তাহার পর অপ্রচলিত সংস্কৃত শব্দকে বাঙ্গালা ভাষায় নূতন সন্নিবেশিত করার ঔচিত্য বিচার্য্য। দেখা যায় লেখকেরা ভূরি ভূরি অপ্রচলিত নূতন সংস্কৃত শব্দ প্রয়োজনে বা নিষ্প্রয়োজনে ব্যবহার করিয়া থাকেন। .. যেখানে বাঙ্গালা শব্দ নাই, সেখানে অবশ্য সংস্কৃত হইতে অপ্রচলিত শব্দ লইতে হইবে। কিন্তু নিষ্প্রয়োজনে অর্থাৎ বাঙ্গালা শব্দ থাকিতে তদ্বাচক অপ্রচলিত সংস্কৃত শব্দ ব্যবহার যাঁহারা করেন তাঁহাদের কিরূপ রুচি, তাহা আমরা বুঝিতে পারি না। (p. 760).

I heartily concur in all that is said above, with the single exception that I would give 'অকারণে' the widest sense it can bear This means that I deny the sufficiency of the কারণs (reasons) which, Bankimchandra thinks, justify the use of মস্তক for মাথা, পত্র for পাতা, and তাম্র for তামা or তাঁবা.

I greatly regret that my comments on Bankimchandra's criticisms are written when he is not alive, and my regret is all the keener because of my personal relations with him when he was alive. I greatly regret also that I have had anything to say against the diction of five other deceased authors, all of whom did marked service to Bengali literature, and four of whom had very kindly feelings towards me. To my late esteemed friend, Babu Chunder Nath Bose, the objection I here make to the putting of fictitious Bengali into the mouths of interlocutors was privately made which he was alive.

It is only great writers who can impart a decided tone to a literary language, and though the language of prose is vastly more potential than the language of poetry, it is in the form of poetry that literature in every language has had its birth. As a further development of this law, a poet would be the best initiator of a revolution in a literary language. It was under the influence of this idea that I asked my dear friend, Hemchandra, to write a few lyrics (wherein, I thought, lay chiefly his power), couched as much as possible in the language in which Bengalis actually think, and weighted with Sanskrit words as little as possible. But alas! my request came too late, for he had then lost his sight, his health, and his power. Our living gifted poet-philologer, Babu Rabindranath Tagore, has given literary dignity to such words as বিষ্ট and অঘ্রাণ. Would not more in this line follow from his pen?

II. Sir Gooroo Dass Banerjee's points of dissent, with comments on them.—The points of dissent expressed by Sir Gooroo Dass Banerjee were three. His first point of dissent, I met by quoting two passages from my article. His second point of dissent was this:—"I do not think that Hinduism taken in its most comprehensive sense will break up before the onset of Western science." I said in reply that I had long regretted having used the words 'the Hindu religion' without any qualifying words to explain what I meant; that I had already added the words 'in its

prevailing form' after the words 'the Hindu religion'; that, by 'the Hindu religion' in the article, I meant the Hindu religion that I saw around me, as made up of fetishism and polytheism with associated mythology, and bound up with caste exclusiveness and ascendancy of the Brahman priest, and that I was well aware that Hinduism covered a wide field, including within its compass such widely divergent creeds as fetishism on the one hand, and idealistic pantheism and agnosticism on the other.*—His third point of dissent was that he was "opposed to Government interference in the matter of language, as it involves a worse restraint on the growth of language than the action of Pandits." On this point I replied that I advocated Government interference only in the matter of primary education, and that, if Government interfered here, it must seek the help of qualified natives of the country, which would act as a safeguard

When I met him later, I learnt that his dissent on the last point still continued, the ground being that there could be no guarantee that the right sort of men would be selected by Government. This, indeed, is a

* It would be extremely difficult to state what the essentials of Hinduism are Hindu birth and conformity to certain Hindu usages apparently constitute its essence, at present To its credit, it leaves the individual free to believe according to his lights, so that the man of Hindu birth, whether he is a Monotheist believing in a personal God, or an Agnostic or a Pantheist, is recognised to be a Hindu, if he conforms to certain Hindu usages This leaves ample room for reform from within Caste, in its time, has served great social ends, and has thus been necessary and beneficial But it cannot endure for ever. Hereditary privileges and hereditary disabilities, being essentially inequitable, are doomed to extinction.

very valid objection on general grounds. But I still hold on to the view that within the narrow limits proposed by me, Government interference could do no harm. The Central Text-Book Committee is a Government organisation which does exercise control over the matter and style of text-books. I do not see what difficulty there could arise if the rule—suggested by me in the *Note on some Points in the Government Resolution, No.* 658, *dated the 7th February* 1905, *on the Establishment of Rural Primary Schools in Bengal,* submitted by me to Government in April 1905—"That in the *prose* portions of primers and other elementary books for the primary stage there must be no departure from the current speech, except where a new conception has to be expressed for which there is no name in the current vocabulary," were approved by Government, and the Central Text-Book Committee were directed to give effect to the rule.

2. PARTITION OF BENGAL—ITS ANNULMENT AND REDISTRIBUTION OF PROVINCES.

From the Modern Review for November 1911.

The human mind is held in thraldom by words. "East is East, West is West, and ne'er the twain shall meet"—is sound logic to most minds. It is not easy though to understand how the superstition has grown up that there is an essential and ineradicable difference between the East and the West, seeing that where Orientals have been in contact with Occidentals, there has been ceaseless interaction between them; and if the West is now the teacher of the East, the East was at one time the teacher of the West. Alphabetic writing, the decimal scale of notation, and the Christian religion itself are of Eastern origin; nay, even the Aryan race, which, absorbing other races in its career of conquest, has achieved all the glories of the West, is now held by some competent inquirers to have had Mongolia for its original home. Marked differences among peoples, in respect of ideas and feelings, have mainly been the results of want of intercommunication. With increased intercommunication and consequent assimilation of foreign ideas and feelings, the. races of men all over the world will tend more and more to approach one common standard of thought and action, such as now prevails over Europe,

America and Australasia. Japan furnishes a notable example of how an Eastern people can assimilate Western knowledge, and can even meet in hostile collision a mighty Western people and bring it to the ground. Mr. Rudyard Kipling's dictum was launched forth before the *meet* took place between Japan and Russia in the Far East. It could hardly have been launched after this *meet*.

Many errors of British administration in India have had their origin in the failure of Britishers exercising authority in this country to realise the fact that the subject population here, despite their subjection, are very much like their countrymen at home and other European nations. Lord Curzon's crowning error of the Partition of Bengal was the offspring of his failure to understand that Bengalis are men moved by ideas and sentiments similar to those which move the peoples of Europe. The idea that community of language, with territorial contiguity or proximity, is the right basis of national unity, has created in Europe political aspirations which have brought about the unification of Italy and of Germany, and which, under the names of Pan-Germanism and Irredentism, threaten to distrub the existing territorial distributions in that Continent. Under the influence of these aspirations, the German-speaking portion of Austria-Hungary gravitates towards Germany, and the Italian Tyrol and Trieste, and also Corsica and Nice, though in a less pronounced way, gravitate towards Italy. Those

Germans and Italians who are averse to such territorial changes being brought about by force of arms may yet cherish the hope that they will ultimately be brought about by the progress of liberal opinion and be based on plebiscites of the people concerned. The idea of community of language being a right basis of political federation has now gone even beyond the conditions of contiguity or proximity of territory. High-type men of English race in Europe, America, Australasia and South Africa have begun to look forward to the day when the English-speaking race all over the world would be politically federated together. When Lord Charles Beresford at a public meeting in America some years ago declared his belief in the ultimate union of the English-speaking world, the audience rose to their feet. The trend of the human mind now is thus towards a political union where there is already a moral union resting on unity of speech, this unity of speech facilitating interchange of ideas and sentiments just as diversity of speech bars it.

The language-basis of nationality was a point that did come under the consideration of Lord Curzon's Government, and was curiously enough put forward, as an argument for the proposed detachment of the Oriya-speaking district of Sambalpur from the Central Provinces and of the Oriya-speaking portion of the district of Ganjam from the Madras Presidency, and their union with Orissa, in the very same document which over Mr. (since Sir) Herbert Risley's signature,

proclaimed the intended splitting-up of the Bengali-speaking people.

The Bengali-speaking portion of India is ethnically one land on the basis of unity of language, and politically it was one before the Muhammadan conquest in the year 1203 of the Christian era, and remained such continuously under Muhammadan and British rule till a slice was taken off it to give sufficiency of administrative resources to the Province of Assam. What remained of it has been ruthlessly cut in twain, by a splitting process devised by a masterful Viceroy and sanctioned by a Secretary of State anxious to please him. Extraordinarily enough democratic England invests the Secretary of State for India with such a wide stretch of authority that a measure of such vital importance can be carried through without any reference whatever to Parliament.

The united efforts of the great body of the leading men in Bengal Proper to have the Partition undone or modified have proved unavailing. It has been pronounced by Lord Morley "a settled fact" and so, by inference, unalterable. As things usually go in political world, Lord Morley's decision could hardly be otherwise. Lord Morley is a man of high intellectual endowments, of liberal instincts and of very wide culture. But his faculty of imagination is obviously weak. In face of Lord Macdonnel's decided pronouncement that the Partition of Bengal has been the greatest blunder since the days of Lord Clive—and Lord

Macdonnel's knowledge of Bengal and Bengalis is equalled by very few members of the ruling race—he has felt himself justified in regarding the agitation against the Partition of Bengal as an expiring flame. He has utterly failed to guage the feelings of the educated portion of the Bengali people, the great majority of whom regard, beyond question, the Partition as a great misfortune for Bengal. He is wofully mistaken in imagining that persistence in upholding the Partition can reconcile the people of Bengal to it, however much it may convince them of futility of all efforts to have it modified in the near furture, at any rate. The destinies of India have now passed from Lord Morley's hands into those of Lord Crewe, and it is for Bengalis to hope that Lord Crewe's view of the Partition question will be more libeıal than Lord Morley's has been.

Sometimes back we had a pronouncement made in the Indian Legislative Council by the Hon. Mr. Mazhar-ul-Haque, who, while very properly objecting to the Hon. Mr. Bhupendranath Basu's introduction of the Partition of Bengal in connection with the Budget question, laid himself open to the same objection by speaking disparagingly of Lord Macdonnel's opinion that the Partition has been an error and advancing against that opinion his own *ipsi dixit* that the Partition has been a beneficent measure, and that any meddling with it by Government would be an act of supreme folly and would cause more discontent and unrest than existed then. The Hon. Mazhar-ul-

Haque, like every other individual, is free, of course, to hold his own opinion on any question. But a mere dogmatic assertion of that opinion, based on what data it is not easy to discover, cannot be a convincing argument, after all. Who is this sapient gentleman, one feels inclined to exclaim, who claims in respect of Bengal and Bengalis higher authority than Lord Macdonnel, and by implication, as now appears, higher authority than even the present Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam, Sir Lancelot Hare, whose speech in the Provincial Legislative Council on the 6th April 1910 made it perfectly clear that there was a pronounced state of unrest and discontent in the province which the Hon. Mr. Mazhar-ul-Haque's rhetorical exclamation cannot, by any means, be supposed to have adequately recognised. A highly competent Muhammadan gentleman, thoroughly conversant with the state of affairs in Eastern Bengal, whom for good reasons I have to leave here unnamed, told me about three years ago that Eastern Bengal was "in a ferment". This ferment manifested itself widely among the school and college-going population, and was fertile of incalculable evil to the juveniles among whom it spread. It has now happily subsided, and there are no organised demonstrations now by school and college students. But there can be little doubt that there must be a smouldering discontent among the juvenile population of Eastern Bengal, if there is a smouldering discontent among

the adult male educated population there. This latter discontent must prevail largely so long as the Bengali-speaking population remains divided.

As Guizot said long ago, unity of language is the basis of *moral unity*. An English-speaking man has necessarily more knowledge of ideas that find expression through the medium of the English language than he has of the output of ideas through French or German. There is very little of French blood in the people of the Haitian Republic; but French being the language of Haiti, the Haitians are French in spirit, and not English or Spanish, although they live in the neighbourhood of English-speaking and Spanish-speaking lands. Unity of language has been creating a feeling of race-patriotism all over the world, and the idea of an ultimate political union of all the English-speaking population of the world has, as already stated, made considerable progress in the English-speaking world. Such being the trend of thought among the English-speaking race, is it not very strange that a prominent man of this race should have taken the retrograde step of breaking up the long-standing unity of the Bengali-speaking people? One marked evil consequence of this breach of unity has already been showing itself in a very bad way. Under rules that have recently come into operation for appointments to the Provincial Executive and Judicial Services in the two Bengals, natives of West Bengal proper are not to be eligible for appointments

in East Bengal, and, *vice versa*, natives of East Bengal, are not to be eligible for appointments in West Bengal Proper. The interests of the Bengali people must suffer from this. Would Englishmen like the population of any part of their country being deprived of the benefit of being served by able men from another part of it? The right principle of selection of men for the public service is to get the best men available without any reference whatever to what part of a country may have given them birth.

Human nature being what it is, a hearty reconciliation to the Partition of Bengal on the part of all Bengalis competent to judge of the manifold bearings of the case is simply impossible. The feeling against the Partition is thus bound to endure. But the sort of agitation in which this feeling has hitherto vented itself requires to be rid of its objectionable features, and the basis of the agitation requires to be widened, so that it may draw towards itself the active sympathies of Indians outside Bengal.

The most objectionable feature in the anti-partition agitation has been the boycott of British and, along with British, of other foreign goods as well. Whatever justification may be urged in favour of boycott as a temporary expedient whereby a weak community can try to secure equitable treatment at the hands of a strong community, it admits of no justification as a permanent line of policy for securing equitable

treatment, or for the promotion of national industries either. Boycott tactics has after all failed to have any influence yet on the Partition question. Nor can it be expected to have any influence on it in future. A continuance of the tactics can only do injury to large numbers of Bengali people and forfeit, in an appreciable measure, the good will of the English people, which must count for much in connection with the welfare of the entire Indian people. Boycott of foreign goods is both economically bad in that it goes against one fundamental principle of economics, namely, the desirability of buying at the cheapest market, which is obviously to the advantage of the buyer. It is a common argument urged by many that by foregoing the buying of the cheaper foreign article, we foster home industries, and so the pecuniary loss suffered should be disregarded. This is by no means a sound view. Be the view sound or not, it must be conceded that the man who holds it should be considered perfectly free to act up to it. But how many among the millions of Bengali-speaking people hold the view? Only a very small minority. Self-sacrifice on the part of this small minority can hardly advance the cause of Indian industries in any appreciable measure. This the advocates of boycott see full well, and so some take to persuading the unwilling by appealing to their patriotic instincts, and others, vastly more numerous than the persuaders, take to coercion and persecution in diverse ways. Letting alone coercion and persecution

as obviously condemnable, can it be maintained that it is not morally bad to persuade poor people who already find life a heavy burden to themselves, to add to that burden by making a sacrifice which they are ill able to make and of which they hardly see the benefit? The worst aspect of boycott is the cult of hate it fosters, hate for the foreigner. This teaching of hate for the foreigner is antagonistic to the growth of a sense of universal human brotherhood which men of the highest type all the world over do now long for.

Protection in any form, as a permanent institution for the promotion of home industries, is bad in every way. It secures handsome profits to a certain section of the population of a country, namely, the producers of some particular commodity, by sacrificing the interest of another and a much larger section of the population, namely, the consumers of that particular commodity. France, for instance, protects her wheat-growers by imposing heavy duties on imported wheat and flour, and the consequence is that bread is considerably dearer in protectionist France than in free-trading England, which in point of wealth is a long way ahead of France. Protection holds out a premium, again, to inefficiency. A protected home market takes away the desire to excel in competition with all foreign rivals. It is wars, antagonisms set up by wars, and apprehensions of wars arising from such antagonism that keep up protection. Human happiness would be promoted all round by the gradual sweeping away of all protections,

and the prospect of such promotion of happiness is likely to be one of the forces that will some day bring about the cessation of wars, and so of the up-keep of vast armaments by land and sea which now crushes nations, particularly those of Europe.

It may well be argued that some kind of protection is needed for fostering industries for the growth of which any country may have special facilities, natural or acquired. Well, the only legitimate means of nursing up infant industries which can reasonably be expected to thrive would be a well-organised system of bounties by the State, which represents the entire country—the bounties to be continued on a gradually decreasing scale, while the industries advance towards the self-supporting stage and to cease when that stage is reached. It would be a great gain to Bengal if the boycott supporters gave up boycott entirely as a means of promoting *Swadeshi* enterprise, and set about organising a wide-spread scheme for the raising of a bounty fund by means of subscriptions, and devised a suitable method for the administration of the fund. The subscriptions being voluntary, they would be an exact measure of the sacrifice each individual subscriber would be ready to make for promoting national industries. The sacrifice involved in a boycott of foreign products is indirect taxation, self-imposed or imposed by social pressure ; and the exact measure of the sacrifice is an unknown quantity. Besides the entire abandonment of

boycott, it is necessary to fully recognise the situation that no agitation on the present lines can bring about a reversal or modification of the Partition of Bengal. Lord Morley, Liberal Secretary of State for India, though he avowed that he did not like the Partition, nevertheless declared it afterwards to be "a settled fact" and so, by implication, unalterable. Sir Edward Baker, the present ruler of the Province now miscalled Bengal, has counselled Bengalis under his rule to give up the vain endeavour to have the Partition undone or modified, though he has admitted constitutional agitation against it to be legitimate, which one must have to understand as meaning unobjectionable, though unwise. Lord Morley's point of view seems to be that though the Partition has not been a wise measure, the undoing of it would be unwise and unstatesmanlike, and no doubt this is a view quite in harmony with current notions regarding the prestige of Government. What the preceding Secretary of State for India has done, the late Secretary of State for India was indeed competent to undo or modify. But if Lord Morley had undone or modified the Partition, a chorus of condemnation would have poured upon him from the majority of his countrymen, who would have decried him as being after all a Radical doctrinaire and no political statesman. No wonder then that Lord Morley decided to let the Partition alone. There was no insuperable bar, it seems, to his bringing the question of the Partition up before Parliament, but

such a course did not commend itself to his judgment as a proper one to take.

Neither the pronouncement of Lord Morley nor that of Sir Edward Baker can convince Bengalis who do believe the administrative separation of a people speaking the same language to be altogether wrong in principle that all efforts to get the Partition modified would be for ever vain. They would go on cherishing the hope that the great British people will ultimately come to see the justice and the expediency of rectifying a measure which was carried through against the declared wishes of the great body of the foremost section of the Bengali people, which keeps up a chronic state of discontent among this people, and which is opposed to an idea in active operation now in Europe, namely, the idea of a political fusion of populations speaking the same language. Secretary of State or Viceroy or Lieutenant-Governor cannot legitimately object to their signalising annually in a constitutional way their detestation of the wrong done by the Partition and to their announcing their hope that the great British people will some day right the wrong done. An established order of things that is essentially wrong cannot endure for ever. The Church of England was long the established Church in Ireland, where 80 per cent. of the people are Catholics. It is gone; and it cannot maintain its footing much longer in Wales, where the people are mostly Dissenters. Can it be expected that those Bengalis who do believe the Partition

to be essentially wrong and who can give free expression to their belief would say or do nothing against the Partition? It will be for the political leaders among the Bengali-speaking people to devise a suitable method of annual demonstration that shall be free of participation by students and of such a practical hardship as the interdiction of cooking involves—a hardship which, if not voluntarily and universally borne,—as a matter of fact it is not,—loses much of its significance, and which has led besides in the past to inquisitorial proceedings and oppression on the part of many young men.

More important than any demonstration would be the elevation of the question of Partition to a higher plane than it now occupies, the transformation of it from a Bengali to an Indian question. This end would be served if the question of the administrative union of the entire Bengali population were merged in the larger question of the desirability of the great administrative divisions in India being all put on linguistic lines. Of such a course of policy a modification of the Partition of Bengal would be a necessary part. If it is bad for Bengalis to be split up and placed under different administrations, it must be equally bad for Hindustanis, Marathas, and Oriyas to be similarly split up and placed under different administrations. Hindustanis in the United Provinces are separated from Hindustanis in the Delhi division of the Punjab, in Bihar, in a portion of the Chota Nagpur

division, and in the Central Provinces; Marathas in the Bombay Presidency are separated from Marathas in the Central Provinces; Oriyas in the Province of Bengal are separated from Oriyas in the Madras district of Ganjam. But it is one thing to remain divided from old and another thing to be divided after having remained united long. This differentiates the Partition of Bengal from the long standing separation of Hindustanis from Hindustanis, Marathas from Marathas and Oriyas from Oriyas.

We are all ardent advocates now of a common Indian nationality. Why then, it may be asked, should there be a cry for putting territorial divisions in India on a language basis? A common Indian nationality is necessary indeed for India's welfare, as will be discussed farther on. Nevertheless the separate peoples, marked each by its language-stamp, that have grown up under the operation of natural forces, must have to be reckoned as sub-nationalities that have each its special interests, which concern itself exclusively; and, on every principle of justice and expediency, each separate people ought to be administratively united for the attainment of its special objects. Bengalis, for instance, stand in special need of physical regeneration, while Punjabis do not stand in such need. Soldiering being laid aside, even the policeman's work in Bengal towns cannot be performed by Bengalis, the necessary physical hardihood required for such work being wanting. Sir George Campbell, while Lieutenant-Governor of

Bengal, put forth the idea that policemen in Bengal Proper should be Bengalis. But the idea could not be carried out then, and it cannot be carried out now either. Such a state of things, should certainly not continue for ever. Co-operation among people speaking the same language would always be easier, again, than co-operation among people speaking different languages. One heavy misfortune that has befallen Bihar in consequence of its not being in administrative union with the United Provinces, as they are now called, but being in administrative union with Bengal and Orissa, may here appropriately be specified. The misfortune is that at the *fiat* of a late Lieutenant-Governor, Hindi books for popular education came to be printed in Kaithi character, standardised with expert help instead of the Devanagari, which is the character in which all Hindi books are printed in the United Provinces and elsewhere outside Bihar and Chota Nagpur ; and even in these two provinces Hindi books read in High English Schools are all printed in Devanagari character. Educationally a barrier has thus been erected between Bihar and other Hindi-using territories in India. Bihar is not an ethnic unit, speaking one language, that language being the only vernacular spoken within its limits and not spoken over any neighbouring area. The word Bihari as meaning a native of Bihar, which, by the way, was not very long ago Behar, has only recently come into use ; and a common name Bihari for the three allied

vernaculars spoken in Bihar—Maithili, Magahi and Bhojpuri—was invented by the Editor of the "Englishman" in the year 1881,* and unfortunately adopted by the eminent scholars, Dr. Hörnle and Dr. Grierson, in place of the earlier name, Eastern Hindi, given to the group by Dr. Hörnle himself. A common name, Bihari, for the Bihar vernaculars, Maithili, Magahi, and Bhojpuri, is no more known to the people than is Platt-Deutsch among the English-speaking peoples as a common name for their own tongue and certain closely allied tongues of Continental Europe. Further, the Bhojpuri vernacular is spoken over a much wider area outside Bihar than in Bihar itself ; and Dr. Hörnle says in regard to Maithili, "Indeed I am doubtful whether it is not more correct to class Maithili as a Bengali dialect, rather than as an E. H. one."† Maithili is, again, written in a character which is almost identical with the Bengali character. Would this Maithili, which has received considerable literary culture, while Magahi and Bhojpuri have hardly received any, submit to be standardized into a common mould with the latter two tongues by some European expert ? The claim lately put forward by certain Bihari gentlemen for Bihar being "a racial unit" is thus noway a tenable one. The town *lingua franca* all over Bihar is Hindustani ; which is besides the mother-tongue of all respectable Muhammadan families in

* Mr. (now Sir George) Grierson's article "In Self-defence" in the *Calcutta Review* for October, 1882.

† Introduction, *Gaudian Grammar* p. viii.

Bihar, and in this Bihar is at one with the United Provinces—nay with even the Punjab.

If all the parts of British India in which Hindustani is the town *lingua franca* were to be administratively united together, the territory would embrace the Punjab and would thus be too large for a Governorship or Lieutenant-Governorship of the existing standard. Any wide departure from existing standards it would indeed be unwise to aim at, except where absolutely unavoidable. So the Punjab, which has acquired a well-marked individuality of its own, may well remain a distinct administrative unit as now, though it should properly give up the Delhi section of it, which, as being the head-centre of Hindustani speech, should properly be attached to the province now called the United Provinces. As a set-off against this loss, Sindh may conveniently be attached to the Punjab, and the two united Provinces may appropriately be called Punjab-Sindh. The rest of the area over which Hindustani is current as the town *lingua franca* would be large enough to be formed into two Lieutenant-Governorships of the existing type. But it being undesirable to divide people racially or linguistically united, the whole of this area, wide though it be, should rightly constitute a single province under the name of Hindustan Proper (*Hindustan Khas*). Burmah covers an area of 263,000 square miles. It cannot be proper on this account to cut it up into two provinces.

Bengal Proper, Orissa and Assam Proper, speaking as they do, closely allied languages, may very well form an administrative unit with the name of "the Bengal Provinces"—a name that can hurt the susceptibilities of neither Orissa nor Assam. These two may have a certain measure of local autonomy each to safeguard their special interests. Indeed where more than one cultivated vernacular happen to be spoken in a province, a certain measure of autonomy for each language-area would be very proper. One injudicious feature of the Bengal Partition has been that it leaves European covenanted civilians in the existing Province of Bengal under the necessity of learning three Indian vernaculars—Hindustani, Bengali and Oriya, written in three different characters—while it makes it necessary for officials of the same class in the new Eastern Bengal and Assam to learn practically one language, to wit, Bengali, for Assamese differs very little from Bengali and is written in Bengali character, barring only two letters, one of which was in use in Bengal within the lifetime of men still living. It would be a wise arrangement if members of the Indian Civil Service were, as a rule, kept within the limits of but two Indian court-vernaculars. Extraordinary linguists like the late Mr. Beames and like Dr. Grierson can be but rare in the Service, and it would be alike a boon to the Service and a great help towards the efficient administration of the law if members of

the Service had not to learn more than two Indian court-vernaculars.

The Bombay Presidency, shorn of Sindh, would consist of Marathi-speaking and Gujrati-speaking territories, with a slice of Kanarese-speaking territory in the south. This last might very well go over to the Madras Presidency, while the Marathi-speaking portion of the Central Provinces might very well join the Marathi-speaking portion of the Bombay Presidency. The Madras Presidency, while it got the Kanarese slice from Bombay, should give up the Oriya slice of the Ganjam district to Bengal. The term *Presidency* is now an anachronism and it should therefore give place to *Province*. On logical grounds the term *Lieutenant-Governor* should also give place to *Governor*. There is logical propriety in an administrative officer immediately under a Governor being called Lieutenant-Governor as in Ceylon, but none in some administrative officers immediately under a Governor-General being called Governors, as are the Governors of Madras and Bombay, and others being called Lieutenant-Governors, as are the rulers of Burmah, Eastern Bengal and Assam, Bengal, the United Provinces and the Punjab, the superior designation being given not by reason of larger territories or larger populations being ruled over by the holders of it than are ruled over by the holders of the lower designation. The term Lieutenant-Governor originated when the Governor-General

was also Governor of the Bengal Presidency. But as it is no longer so, *Lieutenant-Governor* has become a misnomer.* The ruler of each province, great and small, would appropriately be styled Governor, all the Governors being under the Governor-General. The Governors would, of course, be of different grades. Small islands like Mauritius and Hongkong have their Governors, and even so very small an island as St. Helena has its Governor, so that there would be no violence towards the English languages if the administrative heads of all the provinces, large and small, of India including dependencies were styled Governors.

The names of the provinces should have an ethnological basis, be short, and logically sound. The present mis-called Province of Bengal had, at the date of the census of 1901, about 17 millions of Bengalis agianst about 24 millions of Biharis, leaving out of account people akin to the Biharis in the Chota Nagpur division, and about 5 millions of Oriyas. To say nothing of Orissa, which is less populous than the portion of Bengal left in the present Province of Bengal, the name of Bihar is ignored in the name of Province, while in the name of the Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam 1½ millions of Assamese against 27 millions of Bengalis, give Assam co-ordinate

---

* The Indian illogical designation of Lieutenant-Governor directly under a Governor-General has transported itself to distant Canada.

rank with Bengal. Inconveniently long names of political divisions and names incapable of creating any local attachment, such as the North-West Frontier Province, and the Central Provinces, should cease to exist. The Central Provinces, on a division into provinces being made on linguistic lines, would necessarily be broken up. The North-West Frontier Province may very conveniently be called Peshawar after the town of this name. A lengthy official name, like The North-West Frontier Province, based on no local associations and signifying only in what part of the Indian Empire the province so named is situated, cannot be in everybody's mouth and cannot gather popular sentiment around it. Historical names like Mithila and Magadh should be preserved in the names of Commissioners' Divisions.

Indian nationality can only be the more vigorous, if the several sub-nationalities in the country were strengthened by union, and pursued each its special ends unitedly and not dividedly. But why, it may be asked, should there be any aiming at a common Indian nationality, while there is so much diversity of race and language in the country, which, though it has acquired a name for itself, has not a name common to all vernacular languages of the country? The dominant name now is *India*, konwn to all English-knowing people in the country, and the newly-sprung sense of a common Indian nationality seems to cling to this name. *Bharat* and *Hindustan* are the most

considerations of self-interest now dispose them more strongly than ever before to maintain peace among themselves. Every powerful State now professes solicitude for the maintenance of perpetual peace, but so little can powerful States trust one another that each keeps up heavy armaments at an enormous expenditure so as to be ready for war at a moment's notice. Alliances between States, such as the Triple Alliance, which binds together Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy, and the Dual Alliances, one between France and Russia and the other between Britain and Japan, as also the Triple *Entente* between Britain, France and Russia, avowedly rest on the basis of a desire for the maintenance of peace; but they all imply distrust among nations. An alliance or an *entente* is necessarily aimed against Powers outside the alliance or the *entente*.

The growing desire for the avoidance of war has brought about a grand international organization, to wit, the Hague Court of Arbitration, for the adjudication of disputes among nations, and numerous have been the Arbitration Treaties that have been concluded among them. The reservation, in these treaties, of matters of vital interest and points of honour has, however, left the way open to war. Even President Taft's late move for a general Treaty of Arbitration, without any reservations, between nations so closely akin as the British and the Americans, proved a failure. But the move itself is entitled to be taken as a shadow of coming events cast before.

There are certain forces in operation in Europe which are antagonistic to the maintenance of peace, and the most powerful of these forces is the German desire for expansion. The so-called Pan-Germanism that would absorb Switzerland which, if predominantly German, is also largely Latin (French and Italian), Holland and Denmark, which are Teutonic without being German, and Belgium, which is semi-Latin (French) and semi-Teutonic (Flemish), on the plea of their being natural parts of Germany, is about as legitimate as the old illegitimate French theory of the Rhine being a natural frontier of France. Expansion in Europe would not be easy even for Germany, mighty as she is, and it is desired after all by an unwise section of the German people. A reasonable expansion abroad would gratify German ambition by opening out new fields for German activity, and it is for Europe, particularly Britain and France, to see if it could not be arranged to give Germany a reasonable addition to her colonial domain. This question will be discussed further on.

The chief inducement to war is the desire for forcible appropriation of foreign territory. An essential preliminary to the installation of perpetual peace among nations would be a renunciation, on the part of the most advanced and most powerful States of the world, of all forcible appropriation of foreign territory in future. For such renunciation advanced and powerful States that possess large empires are the best prepared.

Britain, whose empire is the largest in the world, and America, whose empire is the fourth largest in extent and the first in respect of compactness of territory and natural advantages combined, can best do without any further extension of territory, and so they may best renounce conquest. One great step possible towards the establishment of perpetual peace among nations would be a close alliance then between the two English Great Powers, namely, the British Empire (cohesively united in respect of all foreign relations, as it is now feeling its way to be) and the American Republic, on the avowed basis of a renunciation of all conquests for themselves in future, and of united action for all defensive purposes and for prevention of war and conquest all over the world. The sentiment of race-patriotism has made great progress in the world, and there is now a warm friendly feeling between Britain and America. The idea of an ultimate political union of all the English-speaking communities in the world has also spread itself among these communities. This political union cannot come about in the near future. But in the way of a close alliance between Britain and America in the immediate future there stands no insuperable obstacle. Such alliance, with the object of insuring peace throughout the world, would benefit the world at large and not benefit simply the contracting parties. America has outlived the stage of living for herself, and the world may now well claim that she should live for the benefit of herself and the rest of the world.

Another great step forward towards the establishment of permanent peace among nations would be a thorough reconciliation between the two great countries, Germany and France. A retrocession of Alsace-Lorraine to France cannot possibly be the price that Germany would pay for purchasing the friendship of France. Frenchmen cannot reasonably complain of the German annexation of Alsace-Lorraine. If the French had beaten the Germans as thoroughly as the Germans did beat them, nothing short of the Rhine frontier would have satisfied them. The retrocession of Alsace-Lorraine being an impossibility, the question remains, is there any means by which friendship can be established between the two great countries now parted by hate. *The only effective means that could bring* about this desirable result seems to be the carrying out of Prince Bismarck's truly statesmanlike idea of a linguistic frontier between the two countries. A linguistic frontier would give back to France the slice of French Lorraine with its French-speaking population of over 200,000, now in German possession; and a suitable compensation to Germany for this retrocession would be the incorporation, with the German Empire, of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, with its population of over quarter of a million. None of the Powers that have guaranteed the neutrality of Luxemburg can *apparently have any motive to withhold its assent to* such incorporation. Luxemburg is ethnically German territory, a German *patois* being the vernacular of the

land, though French has a currency among the commercial classes, and it is also a member of the German Zollverein. From such membership to thorough incorporation would be no very wide a step. Luxemburg, however, not being French territory, it is not for France to give it to Germany. It is reasonable that France should cede to Germany some French territory for getting back the German slice of French Lorraine. The most suitable cession would be a good portion of present French Congo.

The danger to Germany from France alone is a negligible quantity, but the danger to her from France and Russia combined is not a negligible quantity. This danger would be all the greater if Russia would set her house in order by granting full local autonomy to the Poles and the Finlanders and, to conciliate Rumania, to the Rumanians in Bessarabia also. and by granting full religious liberty to the Jews in Russia, disarming thereby the hostility towards her of great Jewish financiers abroad. Furthermore Germany and France do not live solely for themselves They are two of the foremost countries of the world, and the world benefits by their intellectual output even more largely than by their industrial. A cordial feeling between them that would relieve them of the incubus of militarism and so enable them to devote themselves more largely than now to the pursuits of peace, would be a distinct gain to the rest of the world.

The empire of France comes only next after the

British and the Russian in extent. She now possesses Morocco, a country which she had very good reason to covet. If she is relieved of the soreness of feeling caused by 200,000 French people being held in unwilling subjection by Germany, she would naturally be disposed to join the British Empire and America *in renouncing territorial conquests by force and co-*operating with them in preventing war and conquest throughout the world.

To a general pacification of the world, the co-operation of Germany is essential. For inducing Germany to join Britain, America and France in a policy of renunciation of conquest and of prevention of war and conquest throughout the world, a way must be found for gratifying the present German desire for further colonial expansion. German political power has been of slower growth than the British and the French, and even after the overthrow of French power by Germany in 1870-71, Germany has not succeeded in acquiring such extensive foreign possessions as France has acquired. Germany is now naturally envious of the extensive British Empire, and also of the French colonial domain, wider far than that of herself. No unoccupied territories are left for Germany to occupy. Only out of territories already occupied can German ambition for colonial expansion be gratified. There have been speculations about the purchase by Britain and Germany of Portugal's East African and West African colonies, and a secret

agreement about such purchase is believed to have been concluded between the intending purchasers in 1898. The speculations and the supposed secret agreement have tended to thwart the very object desired. Portugal, heavily indebted as she is, has still her pride in her past, and there can be no reason besides why she should part with her East African possessions, of which the revenue considerably exceeds the expenditure, though she may be disposed to part with her West African Colony of Angola, which does not pay its way. It would apparently be an advantage to her if she ceded to Germany, for a heavy price, the eastern half or more of her colony of Angola, where her sway has hardly yet made itself felt, while she retained the western maritime region, where her sway has well made itself felt. Britain, France and Russia, all of whom have been feeling acutely the effects of the increase of German armaments, may well be disposed to strongly persuade Portugal to give up to Germany a territory which she has not resources enough to develop, and which, if given up to Germany, would help the cause of pacification all around. This territory would be a valuable addition to German South-West Africa, as being an elevated region, it would be suitable for colonisation by Germans. But the acquisition by Germany of this territory is problematical, after all, for it hinges on Portugal's willingness to part with it. Some certain field for German colonial expansion has, therefore, to be sought. The cession of part of present French

Congo has already been suggested. But more is wanted to satisfy German ambition. If Britain wishes to be quite friendly with Germany, she should be prepared to make some sacrifices herself by giving Germany certain territories out of her superabundance. First of all, she should give up the enclave of Walfisch Bay, which is of hardly any use to Cape Colony to which it is attached, but is badly wanted by German South-West Africa, for such compensation, territorial or pecuniary, as may be agreed upon. Walfisch Bay is, however, but a small bit of territory. An extensive territory may conveniently be ceded to Germany by Holland and Britain together in New Guinea, so as to make the whole island of New Guinea, measuring about 300,000 square miles, a German possession. Holland has long held the western half of New Guinea without turning it to much account, the unhealthy climate, dense forests and insect pests of the coast regions having apparently been a great obstacle in the way. The eastern half is now held partly by Germany and partly by Britain, and the administration of British New Guinea, now called Papua, has been made over to the Australian Commonwealth. If Holland ceded to Germany the western half for a pecuniary compensation, as she may well be expected to do for securing German friendship as a shield of protection to her eastern Dependencies against any possible Japanese ambition for the absorption of these Malay-Mongolian islands, and Britain ceded the southern

portion of the eastern half for a pecuniary compensation likewise, the whole island of New Guinea would be German. It would be only a tropical German colony however and not a suitable field for German colonisation, though in its uplands in the interior numbers of Germans might settle. It would be *generous on the* part of Britain to be satisfied with a pecuniary, instead of a territorial, compensation, seeing that Germany has far less territory than Britain, and that a pecuniary compensation may very conveniently go over to the Commonwealth of Australia.

Russia's empire, second only in extent to that of Britain, has the inestimable advantage over the latter of being in one compact mass. An empire so vast can very well do without any additions to it ; to consolidate and develop it would be work enough. Russia may well let alone Outer Mongolia and Chinese Turkestan, upon both of which she seems to have her eye. Ultimately they may come under her control or protection by international assent. She has two pressing wants, however, at present, and they require to be satisfied. The ice-free port that she secured in the Far East, she has lost. A port at the head of the Persian Gulf with a long railway zone connecting Trans-Caucasia with that port, she sorely stands in need of. Another need is the free passage through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles of her ships of war, a privilege which must internationally be secured for the ships of war of other nations also. Now that there

is friendship between Britain and Russia, these needs have every chance of being supplied. Russia, thus placated, may reasonably be expected to join the pacifist scheme sketched above, along with Britain, America, France and Germany.

Italy, like Germany, has been ambitious of expansion. Expansion in Europe by conquest, if hard for Germany, would be a great deal harder for Italy. In Africa her attempt to absorb Abyssinia ended in disaster. She is now mistress of Tripoli, a very extensive country indeed, but sterile and inhabited by fanatical Arabs, who will cause her endless troubles. In Europe, however, it is possible for her to obtain a voluntary cession of the island of Corsica, if France is wise enough to see that if it is bad for Frenchmen to be held in subjection by Germany, it must be equally bad for Italians to be held in subjection by France. If both France and Italy recognized the nationality principle as based upon language, it could be arranged that on the basis of plebiscites of the peoples concerned, France would cede Corsica to Italy, in exchange for the French-speaking Aosta Valley in Piedmont *plus* additional compensation, pecuniary or territorial, that might be agreed upon. Eritrea would be the most eligible territorial compensation. A voluntary cession of Corsica by France to Italy cannot fail to have an electrifying effect throughout Europe, as inaugurating an era of equitable redistribution of territory, to secure to France the alliance of Italy, on a defensive basis,

when the present term of Italy's adherence to the Triple Alliance expires, and to dispose Germany to give back to France the portion of French Lorraine now in her possession, as also Austria to cede to Italy the Italian Tyrol and the Italian-speaking parts of Istria, including the city of Trieste, and so satisfy the Irredentists of Italy. It is for France then to take the initial step towards a redistribution of territories in Europe on an equitable basis.

Japan has within a short period of time made large additions to her empire—Formosa, the southern half of Sakhalin, the Port Arthur territory, and the extensive and populous country of Corea. She can have no legitimate longing for further acquisition of territory.

Austria-Hungary is not inhabited by a homogeneous people. She is a multi-lingual State, ill-fitted for expansion. She has lately annexed Bosnia and Hertzegovina, and there are no other likely annexations in her way.

Italy, Japan and Austria-Hungary could hardly think of standing aloof, if the other Great Powers adopted the pacifist scheme advocated in this paper. Not only the Great Powers, but some of the Minor Powers, at any rate, are possible disturbers of peace. To a general pacifist scheme, the co-operation of the minor powers has, therefore, to be invited. If the Great Powers agree, the Minor Powers cannot but follow suit. For inducing all States, great and small,

to join the concert of renunciation of conquest and renunciation of a state of preparedness for war and conquest, the prospect should be held out before them of territorial redistributions being made in future pacifically, on principles of equity as based on the wishes of the peoples concerned. Some such redistributions, as already suggested, may be made immediately and others may follow *pari passu* with the advance of equitable feeling in the world.

What has been said in connection with the German section of French Lorraine, Corsica and the Aosta Valley rests on the two principles enunciated below :—

1. That no section of a civilised progressive nation of which a larger section in the neighbourhood occupies a position of independence, should be held in unwilling subjection by another nation.

2. That language should be recognised as the basis of nationality when a partition line has to be drawn between one nation and another.

If the Balkan allies, after their victorious war with Turkey, had followed the equitable principle of dividing, on an ethnological or linguistic basis, the territories conquered from the Turks, there would have been no war among themselves. The inordinate ambition of Bulgaria spoiled matters, and in the final distribution of territories made after the intrusion of Rumania, ethnological considerations were largely set aside. Clear lines of demarcation separating the Bulgarian, Rumanian, Servian and Greek nationalities

may not be possiblè throughout ; but the rule of the majority, where the populations are mixed, is the only rational rule.

Some transfers of territory in Europe have been pointed out above as possible immediately. Others may come on later. Britain may cede Cyprus to Greece, as she ceded the Ionion Islands long ago, and Germany may give back Danish Schleswig to Denmark. The Aegean Islands, being ethnically Greek, are bound to ultimately come to Greece. The Channel Islands, close to France and ethnically French, enjoy Home Rule and are quite contented with their present English connection. Where transfers of territory cannot be made, it is possible to satisfy the peoples under foreign domination by giving them local autonomy, as has been largely done in Austria, in the case of her non-German populations,—Czech, Polish, Ruthenian, etc., though Hungary unwisely aims at Magyarising her non-Magyar populations—Slav, German and Rumanian. Poles in Austria have local freedom, but Poles in Russia and Prussia have it not. In Prussia the Expropriation Act of 1908 has been doing its cruel work of spoliation of Poles in the Province of Posen ; and the Polish language remains interdicted in Posen, the French language in the German part of French Lorraine, and the Danish language in Danish Schleswig. These are "methods of barbarism" quite unworthy of Germany's high civilisation. The German policy of Germanising the Poles in Posen has had its nemesis in

the Russian policy of Russianising the Germans in the Baltic Provinces.

The partition of Africa among some of the European Powers, ending with the Italian annexation of Tripoli, has prepared the way for the prevalence of universal peace. The partition has almost exhausted the field of possible aggression by civilised peoples upon territories inhabited by uncivilised peoples or by semi-civilised peoples unable at present to maintain order in their lands. The aggressive spirit has thus come to be now very nearly at the end of its tether. If some countries, which have not yet come under European or American rule, prove themselves incapable of maintaining order within their borders, the best thing for them would be to be placed under international control and to remain under such control till they are able to stand on their own legs. This international control may conveniently, by delegation, be a dual control, in some particular case, as that of Russia and Britain in the case of Persia, and a triple control in some other, as that of Britain, Italy and France in the case of Abyssinia.

If wars and the objective of wars, i.e. conquests, are to cease, consistency of principle would require that conquests made in the past should be humanised to the utmost extent possible. The United States working now in the Philippines with the avowed object of fitting the Filipinos for self-government as rapidly as possible, is a new factor in the East that will doubtless promote the cause of good government in the

Eastern Dependencies of Britain, Holland and France. The contemplated retirement of the Americans from the Philippines, if it becomes a reality, will be felt by subject Asiatic nationalities as a misfortune. The contemplated retirement is a reflex of the Monroe Doctrine. The Philippines are in the Old World, and so they must be abandoned: Porto Rico is in the New World, and so it may be retained. The Americans act unwisely after all in retaining possession of Porto Rico, for this must cause irritation in Latin America. The retention of the Philippines would cause no irritation anywhere.

If the Hague Court of Arbitration is universally recognised as the Tribunal for the pacific settlement of all differences between States, the necessity for maintaining armed forces would not entirely cease. Armed forces on such a colossal scale as are now maintained by the Great Powers would not be needed when all chances of war among them disappear. But armed forces on a very much reduced scale—without the curse of conscription for recruitment—would still be needed for maintaining internal order, and for quelling disorder and strife wherever they might break out abroad, including revolutionary warfare. It would be a great benefit to the world if revolutions were to be taken cognisance of internationally, and if such as were judged harmful were put down by suitably devised international organisation, whereby the armed forces of governments nearest to hand could at once be made

available for putting down revolutionary violence that is judged harmful. The interference in the affairs of revolutionary Mexico now decided upon by the United States is a salutary departure in foreign policy.

When conquests by force of arms cease, conquest by pacific penetration must continue, according to the laws of demand and supply and superior fitness. Chinamen have been pacifically overrunning the Indo-Chinese Peninsula and the Malay Archipelago, and Italians have been pacifically overrunning Argentina. If Australia, British Columbia and the Pacific States of the American Union had not been closed to Asiatic immigration, Chinese, Japanese and even Indian immigrants would have pacifically overrun these lands. America has been illiberal enough to stop Japanese and Chinese immigration to Hawaii, and Chinese immigration to the Philippines. The question of free immigration cannot now be dealt with internationally. The economic dread of cheap Asiatic labour overcoming in competition dear White labour lies at the root of the prohibition of Asiatic immigration. China has now shaken off her leaden conservatism of ages, and when she wins for herself a high place among nations, as Japan has done, the immigration question, in which both China and Japan are vitally interested will be likely to enter into the field of international politics.

If wars were not, the feeling that is at the bottom of protectionist tariffs would lose strength and

ultimately die out. It is the possibility of wars among nations that keeps up the feeling that the interests of one nation are antagonistic to those of others. Protectionism is anti-humanitarian, opposed to the sentiment of universal human brotherhood. Even as regards the interests of any particular protectionist country, protectionism benefits certain sections of the people of that country, namely, the producers of particular commodities, by injuring other sections, namely, the consumers of those commodities. All desirable ends could be met by the grant of bounties for nursing up suitable industries, the bounties to decrease gradually and to disappear altogether when no longer required. Reduction of armaments, on an extensive scale, would make it unnecessary to raise such vast revenues as are raised at present, and duties might on this account be reduced and finally put out of existence, leaving trade and commerce perfectly unfettered. Graduated taxes on property and income would be the main taxes in a world of peace in future.

Sir Max Waechter has been advocating for some time past a scheme for the discarding of tariffs among European countries as a means of putting an end to wars among them and federating them together, so that confederated Europe may compete on equal terms with the United States of America and make her power and influence supreme in the world. He tells us that all European countries are "in full sympathy

with my [his] proposals," but that "it is difficult to find any State disposed to take the initiative." That no State is disposed to take the initiative must be owing to great practical difficulties in the way. The fact is that perfectly free trade between any two States would be possible only if they have a cordial feeling towards each other and a common sense of solidarity. In Europe a Customs Union would be possible now between Germany and Austria-Hungary, allied together and protectionist both, but would hardly be possible between Holland and Belgium, because Holland is a free-trading country and Belgium a protectionist one, though with a very moderate tariff. Sir Max Waechter admits that the Protectionist spirit, which dominates most Continental countries, is the greatest obstacle that lies before his scheme, but with the faith of an enthusiast, he pronounces it to be "by no means hopeless." The Protectionist spirit, it would not be easy to overcome. It is only after it has been overcome, and a feeling of amity established between a number of nations that those nations can be federated together.

The scheme for a European Union is a narrow scheme after all, and, if such Union could be effected, it would inevitably call into existence an American Union, embracing both North and South America, divided far less in the matter of languages spoken than Europe is. Economic antagonism would thus be created between Europe and the American Continent; and

in economic competition with the latter, the former must go to the wall. The idea of a confederated Europe rests on the illusion produced on the human mind by a common name applied to an extensive and continuous stretch of territory. Europe has acquired a common name as distinct from Asia, Africa and America, and has thus come to be regarded as possessing interests distinct from those of Asia, Africa and America. Sir Max Waechter stands up for "Free Trade throughout the whole of Europe with a common tariff against all non-European countries." Now this Europe has an Empire, the Russian, which, besides covering half of Europe, covers, in continuous stretch with its European territory, over a third of Asia. Can this Empire be expected to put up a tariff barrier between its European and Asiatic sections, while it does away with tariff barriers between European Russia and the rest of Europe? Another European country, France, now reckons Algeria as an integral part of France. Can France be persuaded to keep up a tariff wall between France and Algeria, while she abolishes tariffs with all European countries outside France?

Pan-Europeanism and Pan-Americanism have each a factitious basis The racial affinities and trade relations of one European State, Britain, with two North American countries, the United States and Canada, are certainly closer and more extensive than with Russia. Britain's trade relations, again, with Argentina are more extensive than those of any

American country with her; while, as regards racial and linguistic affinities, Argentina stands much closer to Spain and Italy than to the greatest South American country, Brazil, or the two greatest North American countries, the United States and Canada. The beneficent work of breaking down tariff barriers between States would work along the line of least resistance if it took as its initial step the establishment of a Customs Union between the United British Empire on the one hand and the United States of America on the other. Sentiment is a potent factor in the regulation of human affairs, and sentiment would greatly favour the commercial federation of the entire English world. Pan-Europeanism, Pan-Americanism, and the like must jar against the feelings of men of cosmopolitan instinct all over the world, men who cherish the idea of an ultimate federation of the world, the formation of a World-State, whose members would remain in perfect amity and work together in a spirit of friendly rivalry.

4.—DECLINING POPULATION, ALCOHOLISM AND PROTECTIONISM IN FRANCE.

(An extract from the Modern Review Article of July 1914)

The wide disparity that has grown up in about thirty years' time between Germany and France in the matter of population and industrial and commercial expansion has greatly disturbed the political equilibrium of Europe. Over a territory very nearly equal to that of the German Empire, France has now a population of only 40 millions against Germany's 65 millions. This in itself is a heavy disadvantage on the side of France. Germany's superior density of population is certainly the effect of her industrial superiority, and this industrial superiority is mainly due to her vastly larger resources in coal (including lignite), rather than to any inherent superiority of the Teutonic race which remained latent so long and has burst forth suddenly into view. Quoted below are figures about the output of coal in Germany and in France for the years 1840, 1870 and 1894 from Mulhall's *Industries and Wealth of Nations*, 1896, p. 146, and for the year 1911 from the *Statesman's Year-Book*, 1913, p. 877 and p. 802.

	Year	Output	Year	Output
Germany ..	1840	3,400,000 tons	1870	34,000,000 tons.
	1894	99,100,000 ,,	1911	234,508,447 ,,
France ..	1840	3,300,000 ,,	1870	13,000,000 ,,
	1894	25,200,000 ,,	1911	39,229,591 ,,

But about 30 years ago, France stood only next after the United Kingdom commercially. Now she has fallen behind the United States and Germany also.

Letting alone Germany with her very large coal resources, it is certainly very surprising that the density of population in fertile France should be 189·5 to a square mile, while in mountainous Switzerland, with no coal resources to speak of, it should be 234·8 to a square mile. If France were as thickly peopled as Switzerland, her population would be nearly 49 millions instead of nearly 40 millions.

The population question is a large question in itself. So it cannot be adequately dealt with here. Certain aspects of the question require, however, to be touched upon in connection with the future of France as bearing upon the prospects of permanent peace and disarmament in the West and the continued influence of the noble French race upon the other races of the world. In some respects the French are the most vanward people in the world. The practice of artificially limiting birth has come to prevail more largely among them than among any other civilized people. The New England States of America, Great Britain and Australia have largely adopted the practice, and even Germany has recently been showing a clearly declining birth-rate. It is a significant fact that the population of Corsica, Italian as it is, showed at the last census a decrease, while the population of Italy showed a large increase. Corsica's political connection with

France seems to have saturated the island with French social and economical ideas. The practice of limiting births has arisen from economic necessity. There is no chance of its being given up and of a return to the old regime of reckless multiplication, which means over-population and consequent multiplication of human suffering. But in so far it tends to produce evil effects, it requires to be effectively checked.

The population question is the most serious question that now faces France. The last census showed an excess of births over deaths in only 21 departments out of 86, and in the small territory of Belfort. In the remaining 65 departments the deaths exceeded the births. Italian, Belgian, German, Spanish and Swiss immigrants have been pouring into France. But for this influx, the population of the whole country would, at each successive census, show a decrease instead of a slight increase. Mr. Charles Dawbarn's article in *The Nineteenth Century and After* for December 1906 has the following passage :—"The number of families in which there is only one child is very significant. Out of every thousand families, 249 have one child only, 224 two children, and 150 three."

That very nearly one-fourth of the married couples in France have only one child each does in itself spell national deterioration, for the first child in a family of more children than one is generally not the cleverest. This is a popular belief in Bengal, based doubtless on wide observation. Statistics collected by the

Eugenists also support the theory. Napoleon and Nelson would not have been born if the parents of each had but one child. It seems desirable that every well-endowed couple in every walk of life should have five children, two to replace the parents, one to add to the population of the country, one for emigration to any foreign land where men are wanted, and one for the contingency of early death.

The French are a people of high mentality, and they have been trying to arrest the progress of depopulation in their country, but as yet with no effective results. There is no infecundity in the race, for it multiplies rapidly in Canada. But in Canada, the Catholic Church rules over the French-speaking province of Quebec, which is not the case with France, and the Catholic Church encourages early marriage. The province of Quebec has recently had its area doubled to 700,000 square miles, though part of the added area has a frozen soil unfit for tillage, and it is in Quebec that the best hope lies for the future of the French race outside France. The low point to which the birth-rate has declined in France is a necessary outcome of the individualistic regime, and so in this country this regime requires to be now supplemented by socialistic measures for the rearing up of desirable future generations. This has become a more pressing question here than anywhere else. The rearing of desirable succeeding generations is bound to become a national concern everywhere ultimately. Human

welfare demands that individualism should have free play, and that individual success like that of Mr. Andrew Carnegie should be a fountain for the flow of good to society. Generally, however, at present, individualism works towards giving one's own children unfair advantages over other peoples' children. The State should rectify this state of things so far as is possible, by giving all children equality of advantages at the start in life.

Besides depopulation, France suffers from certain other evils, on which sympathetic foreigners like the present writer may claim to offer their friendly observations. One crying evil from which France suffers at present is alcoholism. She has now the sad pre-eminence of being the largest consumer of alcohol per head of population in the world. The vested interests of vine-growers and distillers appear to have an overpowering influence upon the legislature, and the consequence is that the people at large are being ruined in body and mind by the excessive consumption of alcohol. The State encourages intemperance too, it seems, as a means of swelling up the revenue. As France's ally, Russia, is now, under the noble initiative of the Tsar, going to be freed from thraldom to the fiery drink, vodka, it is to be hoped that there will be a vigorous crusade also in France against absinthe and other deadly drinks. Fortunately, the womanhood of France has already begun to array itself against the drink evil.

Protectionism is an evil which afflicts France, but it afflicts also Germany. The Second Empire, bad as it was in so many ways, had one good feature. It followed a free-trade policy, and France, under the Cobden treaty of 1860, prospered greatly. Thiers brought in a reactionary protectionist regime, and this regime still holds sway in France, and makes bread dearer than in far richer England. When the popular voice becomes more potent in France than now it is, protectionism will doubtless receive its *coup de grace.* A free-trade policy, by making life a little easier than at present, would be likely to give a lift to the birth-rate in France.

5. THE REV. J. KNOWLES'S SCHEME FOR THE ROMANIZATION OF ALL INDIAN WRITING.

(*From the Modern Review for February, 1918.*)

Romanized Hindustani has long been before the world, and it is about thirty-six years since the late Mr. J. F. Browne, Judge then of the 24-Parganas District in Bengal, carried on his propaganda for the employment of the Roman alphabet in writing Bengali. He won over two notable adherents, got Bankimchandra's famous novel, দুর্গেশনন্দিনী ("Durgeshanandini"), printed in Roman character (Roman Akshare Mudrita), and circulated copies of the book as thus printed. In the preface to the romanized edition of the book, issued in the year 1881, it is stated that Bankimchandra, though "opposed to the views of the Roman Akshara Samaj," allowed his book to be brought out in a romanized garb "from a spirit of liberality and of fairness to the views of others." In the same year, 1881, in opposition to Mr. Browne's scheme, I put forth, in the *Calcutta Review*, an article entitled "A Universal Alphabet and the Transliteration of Oriental Languages." I was then, as I am now, a believer in the ultimate prevalence of a cosmopolitan alphabet, built up with the Roman small letters, but divested of the defects that now

attend the Roman alphabet *and the system of writing* based upon it. The Roman alphabet is the most widely spread alphabet in the world ; and the three foremost races of men in the world—the English-speaking, the German-speaking and the French-speaking—use it, the German black-letter alphabet being substantially the same as the Roman and on the way to yield place to the latter. Another point in its favour is that it admits of being printed in much smaller type than alphabets of the Persi-Arabic and Devanagari families. This, however, is not a matter of primary importance. But after all, it is not at all desirable that the Roman alphabet, as it is, should become the universal alphabet of the world. I quote below, in this connection, five passages from my article.

(1) "In making the Roman the basis of a universal alphabet, however, there can be no reason why its patent defects should be cherished and perpetuated. Reason and human happiness demand that its deficiencies should be made good by supplementary letters in the case of languages whose sounds it cannot adequately represent, and that the superfluous symbols it has be rejected or otherwise utilised. Such obvious defects, again, as the existing divergence between capital letters and small letters, and between printed letters and script letters should be got rid of."

(2) "In choosing between the forms of capital and small letters there can be little hesitation which to throw overboard. The very difficulty of writing

capitals medially or finally led, it appears, to the invention of small letters. Small letters are so much simpler in form and so much more largely employed than capital letters, that to give up the latter would certainly be to work along 'the line of least resistance'."

(3) "The present wide difference between printed and script letters may be reconciled. In Italics we have the connecting link between the two sets of symbols. In printing, or in the current hand, the letters need not, however, be slant, as the Italic characters are. Erect letters shaped like Italics, would effect a full reconciliation between printing and current handwriting; while Italic characters in their present slant froms could be reserved for the purposes they now serve."

(4) "Looking to existing facts, it seems quite clear that a universal alphabet must be based on the Roman. The Roman alphabet has certain inherent merits of its own, but what is of far more importance than this is the fact that all Western Europe—the chief seat of science, learning and industry—uses this alphabet (the German alphabet being substantially the same as the Roman); and all America (destined to become hereafter the most populous quarter of the globe), and the rising English-speaking communities in Australasia and South Africa use it too.

The Greek or Greek-derived alphabets current in the eastern half of Europe (with the exception, and

that partial only, of the circumscribed territory now left to the Turks), and in the vast, though now sparsely peopled Russian dominions in Asia do not differ very widely again from the Roman alphabet. Everything therefore points to the Roman alphabet, with necessary modifications, ultimately superseding all other forms of writing."

(5) "The haphazard arrangement of the letters in the Roman alphabet, though pre-eminently historical, for its origin can be traced back even to the primitive hieroglyphic writing, ought likewise to be abandoned for something like the scientific arrangement of the Devanagari alphabet. The letters of the alphabet should be named after some uniform system like that which obtains in Devanagari, and not certainly in the unsystematic English way, which in this respect contrasts very unfavourably with that of the rival nation across the Channel."

In my article, I criticised in detail the system of transliteration followed by Mr. Browne. About this I need say here nothing more than this, that in following the orthodox mode of transliteration he made many of his romanized Bengali words un-Bengali, after all. I give only two examples. Sahya for সহ্য (pronounced sojjho), and svatva for স্বত্ব (pronounced satto) can hardly be called Bengali.

In the year 1910, the Rev. J. Knowles brought before the world, in his booklet, *Our Duty to India and Indian Illiterates*, a far more elaborate scheme than

the late Mr. Browne's, for the writing of all Indian languages by means of Roman letters, supplemented, not by diacritically marked Roman letters, but by "the phonotypic letters of Sir Issac Pitman and Mr. A. J. Ellis, with Romanic letters for the Indian 'cerebrals' and the 'peculiar Semetic gutturals and sibilants' "— the whole lot, Roman letters and supplementary letters, being styled Romanic by the reverend gentleman. He gives up the haphazard historical arrangement of the letters in the Roman alphabet, and adopts the scientific arrangement of the Indian alphabets, the chief of which is the Devanagari. He discards one glaring defect of the Roman alphabet, namely, the existence of capital letters different in shape from small letters, but retains another glaring defect, namely, cursive letters different in shape from the corresponding letters as printed. The reason assigned for the retention of this defect is by no means satisfactory. "There is some reason", says he, "in having slightly different forms in reading and writing—the book in hand is easy to read, the business hand facile to write—but the capitals may be left out, especially as in Indian languages there are no capitals." Indian languages have not only no capitals, but they have no recognised cursive letters anyway distinct from letters as they are printed. The letters as printed are the same as they are written. Such slight variations as facile writing demands are allowed, and every writer is free to make his own slight variations. Such variations are very much slighter

than the specimens of the "slightly different forms" given on p. 65 of the Rev. J. Knowles's booklet. Some of these so-called "slightly different forms" are considerably or even largely different, while they are all slant, while the printed letters are all vertical. In Indian writing there is no change from verticality to obliquity. In giving up an Indian and adopting in its place a Romanic alphabet, it is certainly not desirable that we should give up any advantage that we now possess and adopt instead a disadvantage.

The use of dots as diacritical marks may be called a faulty system, particularly for the reason that dots have a knack of being omitted in writing. But appendages to Roman letters on Pitman's system as given on p. 34 of the Rev. J. Knowles's booklet are faultier in that they do not lend themselves to facile writing, while the multiple means, on Pitman's system, for marking the long sounds of vowels is most objectionable. To appendages invented, it would be far more difficult to secure universal assent than to the use of dots. Dotting seems to be the easiest method of modifying Roman letters for representing sounds slightly different from those which are properly their own. To say nothing of the unnecessary dots over the Roman letters i and j, dotting exists in German, in connection with the letters a, o, and u; and it is a distinguishing trait of the Arabic alphabet and its variants that are in use throughout the Musalman world. It is a characteristic also of all current systems of transliteration by Roman

letters, of Indian and other Asiatic writing. Transliteration and the writing and printing of hitherto unwritten languages in Roman character have been preparing the way for the ultimate adoption of a universal alphabet of which the letters shall be the Roman small letters, with supplementary small letters for supplying the deficiencies of the Roman alphabet, and the arrangement of the letters in the alphabet shall be the scientific Indian arrangement. For this reason such universal alphabet may very properly be called Indo-Romanic, a name used by Sir Monier Williams in his Sanskrit-English Dictionary; and it will be for every lagnuage to use as many letters of this alphabet as will suffice for expressing all its elementary sounds. The initiation by Sir William Jones, in the year 1788, of the romanization of oriental writing deserves to be regarded as an epoch-making event, for it was the initial step, though unconsciously taken, towards providing the world with a universal alphabet. In the application of the Roman character to the writing of an oriental language, Sir William Jones had indeed been anticipated by a Protuguese Padre who brought out, in the year 1743, a Bengali Grammar and Dictionary in Portuguese, the Bengali words in the book being in the Roman character and spelt according to the rules of Portuguese pronunciation.* The Padre's aim was thus the limited one of

---

* *The Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. V, Part I, Introduction, p. 23.

helping such of his countrymen as might have proselytising work to do in Bengal, and not to devise, like Sir William Jones, a general scheme of transliteration into Roman character. The Rev. J. Knowles's move has been a step forward in this direction, but a faulty move in certain respects. A further step forward and a faultless one is needed. If India or any other country is to give up its own method of writing and adopt the one which may well be called, as said above, the Indo-Romanic, it is necessary that all defects whatever that cling to the Roman method of writing as now prevalent in Europe, and the much wider Europe that some European nations have created abroad, should be avoided.

On p. 2 of the Rev. J. Knowles's booklet occurs the following sentence:—"The British and Foreign Bible Society reports that the illiteracy of the people of India is the greatest hindrance to the spread of the Gospel"; and on p. 8 of the booklet the point dealt with is, "The Great Cause of Illiteracy—Complicated Native Characters." The greatest hindrance to the spread of the Gospel in India is *not* the illiteracy of the Indian people, but the existence of the Hindu and Mahammadan religious systems. A German missionary told me long ago that it was hard to convert Hindus and Mahammadans to Christianity, for they had their Ramayan and their Koran. It is quite a fallacy, again, to say that the complicated native characters are the cause of Indian illiteracy. Literacy

and illiteracy in all countries have, in the absence of a compulsory system of education, been governed by the parctical needs of the people concerned, and not by the simplicity or complexity of the method of writing that is prevalent. Burma has a complicated system of writing, while Spain and Portugal have a simple system, using, as they do, in common with the rest of Western Europe, the Roman alphabet. But literacy is far more wide-spread in Burma than in Spain and Portugal. Up to the time of the Franco-German war of 1870-71 literacy in Scotland was a long way ahead of literacy in England, though the system of writing in both the countries was the same. England has the same non-phonetic, conventional and inconsistent system of writing now as she had forty-six years ago. Literacy has within these forty-six years made immense strides in England, not because of any improvement in the English system of writing, but because of the adoption of compulsory education in the country. In learning to read and write words of the language that one speaks, the difficulty felt is comparatively small, however badly the words may be spelt ; but the difficulty is very great to the foreigner when the language that he has to learn is badly spelt, as is the English language. The Rev. J. Knowles's estimate of the difficulty of learning any of the Indian indigenous systems of writing has been formed from the foreigner's and not the native's stand-point. His idea seems to be that it is as difficult for an Indian child speaking

any particular Indian language to learn the indigenous system of writing that language as it is for an English missionary to learn it, and he forgets that if the English system of writing, which is far worse, for instance, than the Bengali system, which too is bad enough, does not materially obstruct the English-speaking child's acquiring the English system of writing, there can be no reason why the Bengali system should prove an obstruction to the Bengali child. The words of a child's vernacular tongue being known to the child, the difficulties that attend such bad spelling as 'have' and 'gave'; 'laugh' and 'thought'; '*thin*' *and* 'then'; 'bough' (bau), 'bow' (bau), and 'bow' (bō or rather bŏŏ) are overcome without much trouble. But to the foreigner the trouble is very great. Englishmen have a wide field of charity in their own land trying to save rising generations of English children from the necessity of learning the present very faulty system of English writing, by setting up a phonetic system of writing in its place.

The Rev. J. Knowles's endeavour is decidedly well-meant, but it is faulty and premature. The ideal in all schemes of alphabet reform should be the prevalence, ultimately, of a universal alphabet. The first practical step towards the adoption of a universal alphabet should be an agreement among the nations of the world that now use the Roman alphabet (the German black letter alphabet is substantially the same as the Roman), about uniformity of sound for each letter of the alphabet

and about modifications of Roman letters for representing elementary sounds wanting in the Latin language.

To take the vowels first: "There are eleven Latin vowels: ă ā ĕ ē ŏ ō ĭ ī; y; ŭ ū......y was a sound unknown in common Latin, and imported into the learned language from Greece; it answers to French u or to German ü in Müller, with, however, a marked tendency to pass into i." (Brachet's *Etymological Dictionary of the French Language,* Clarendon. Press Series, 2nd Edition, Introduction, p. xlviii). Leaving aside the dubious y, the five vowels a, e, o, i, u, with their long and short sounds, have not the same uniform power in all the languages that are written with the Roman letters. In the English language, the letter a, for instance, has, in addition to the proper short and long Latin sounds, as in the words *mica* and *father,* respectively, so many as five other distinct sounds, as in *any, hate, hat, what* and *all.* In German ä, ö and ü are used for representing sounds wanting in Latin. In French the simple u-sound is represented by ou, and the letter u is used for representing a peculiar French vowel sound. All such divergences require to be expelled by the adoption of a uniform system.

As regards consonants, it may be instanced that in Latin, "c was hard and pronounced like k" (Brachet's *Dictionary,* p. lxxv), but that in English, French and German it is sounded sometimes as k and sometimes as s, and that in Italian it has sometimes the k-sound

and sometimes the English* ch-sound, a sound which is represented in English by ch or tch, in French by tch and in German by tsch. It has been a good device adopted by the Royal Asiatic Society and the Asiatic Society of Bengal to appropriate c to the English ch-sound (Devanagari च-sound) and it has been not a bad device also to appropriate j for representing the English j-sound (Devanagari ज-sound). In Latin the sound of j was i-i (Brachet's *Dictionary*, p. xc). If c is employed to represent the Devanagari च-sound, then it would be very proper, it seems, to employ ç for representing the Bengali চ-sound in পাঁচ-টাকা (which is the general East Bengal sound of চ and is intermediate between the English ch and s-sounds), instead of employing it, as is done by the Aşiatic Society of Bengal, for representing the Devanagari श-sound, which corresponds to the English sh-sound in *show*. Now s' having in French writing a sound, different from the Devanagari श-sound and identical or very nearly identical with the स-sound, it is certainly objectionable to employ it for representing the श-sound. The s-sound of c and ç could not have come direct from the k-sound of c. It must have come through the intermediation of the ch or च-sound, which is akin to the k-sound. Again ç is very unlike in shape to s; but it is desirable that the allied sounds, s and sh in English, should be represented by characters

* It is here assumed that the English ch and j sounds are simple sounds corresponding to the sounds च and ज, respectively, and not compounds, as tsh and dzh.

similar in shape. The device of representing the English sh-sound by a reversed s, after the example of the reversal of ए by the Asiatic Society of Bengal for representing the short e-sound, might answer well, it seems. The device in the Esperanto alphabet of representing the English sh-sound in *show* by putting an angular mark over s, and the device of using the accent mark over s, adopted by the Royal Asiatic Society, are far less objectionable than the representation of the श-sound by ç.

The nations of Western Europe and of the much wider Europe which some of them have created abroad should first set their own house in order by having for their use a common Roman alphabet with one uniform sound for each letter and a letter for each simple sound, before they can successfully carry on a propaganda for the supersession, ultimately, of all other alphabets by the Roman. But transliteration into Roman letters is a present necessity in respect of proper names at any rate. It is in every way desirable, therefore, that by international agreement there should be one method of transliteration or rather of phonetic transcription in Roman character, for there is the outstanding fact that certain letters of non-Roman alphabets have not the same powers in all languages that are written with them.

In Japan there has been a "Society for the Romanization of Japanese," and the "Indian Daily News" of the 16th November 1916, contained the following

announcement :—"Japan has decided to adopt the Latin alphabet. A Scientific Commission has been appointed to effect the transcription. From next year the teaching of the Latin alphabet will become compulsory in the schools of the country." That in China "Roman letters are becoming more used," the Rev. J. Knowles informs his readers on p. 48 of his booklet. On postage stamps and the like, such letters have become a necessity. With Japan using the Latin alphabet, China cannot stick very long to her ideographs.

The eminent German savant, Lepsius, put forth long ago a Standard Alphabet, but it has made no way yet to general adoption among scholars for purposes of transliteration, much less to general acceptance among the nations of Europe. Lepsius's Standard Alphabet has a rather complicated system of differentiating symbols, including some vowel letters under others, and a few Greek letters too against the much simpler process of mere dotting letters. This has been a serious bar in the way of its being generally adopted.

Lepsius expresses himself thus in regard to the sounds of the Sanskrit language, and the Devanagari characters which represent them :—"No language has a system of sounds more rich and regularly developed than the *Sanskrit*, or expresses them so perfectly by its alphabets. The old grammarians of India did not, indeed, invent the *Devanagari* characters, but they brought them to the state of perfection which they

now possess. With an acumen worthy of all admiration, with physiological and linguistic views more accurate than those of any other people, those grammarians penetrated so deeply into the relations of sounds in their own language that we at this day may gain instruction from them, for the better understanding of the sounds of our own languages. On this account no language and no alphabet are better suited to serve, not as an absolute rule, but as a starting point for the construction of a universal linguistic alphabet, than that of ancient India."* But when he considers the question of the arrangement of the letters in an alphabet for the world, he exhibits a narrow, illiberal spirit, and the characteristic European pride, as the passage quoted below from the *Standard Alphabet* (pp. 16-17) will show.

"A scientific arrangement can only be obtained by keeping Vowels and Consonants by themselves, and by arranging the latter according to the different classes of organs......Any arrangement of the letters according to the organs would present great difficulty to Europeans who are accustomed only to the Latin mode......For foreigners, however, who will have under any circumstances to relinquish their accustomed succession of letters, it is of little importance what new arrangement they may adopt, where convenience and practical utility only are aimed at.. The case

---

* *Standard Alphabet*, 2nd Edition, 1863, English Translation, p. 37.

would assume a different aspect, if the alphabetical arrangement of European languages were as diversified as their orthographies. In this case a new and necessarily *organical* arrangement would be unavoidable. But inasmuch as all European nations use one and the same order of letters as handed down to them by the Romans, who received it from the Greeks, who again received it thousands of years ago from the Phœnicians, they possess also the right of communicating the historical arrangement as well as the characters themselves to the foreign nations."

It is not easy to see what could induce Indians, who do keep "Vowels and Consonants by themselves" and arrange the latter "according to the different classes of organs," to give up this scientific method which, by the way, is also their historical method, and adopt the European method, which is historical indeed but quite unscientific. The adoption of the character k for the character क, or any other corresponding Indian character, of the character g for the character ग or any other corresponding Indian character, and so forth, would be quite a different kind of thing from a downright adoption of the Latin alphabet, as it is. The former is desirable as being a means of securing, not only Indian solidarity in the matter of writing, but as largely advancing the cause of cosmopolitan solidarity. The latter is undesirable as being a retrograde movement from a scientific to an unscientific stage of alphabetic evolution.

The application by Sir William Jones in the year 1788 of Roman letters to the transliteration of Oriental writing deserves, as I have already observed, to be remembered as an epoch-making event, for it was the initial step, taken for the institution of an alphabet for the entire world. But a long conflict awaits the devising of a system of phonetic writing that will command universal adhesion. "There are many phonetic alphabets," says Mr. Walter Rippmann in his *Sounds of Spoken English* (p. 24), and out of the many he has adopted for his book the alphabet of the Association Phonétique Internationale of Paris, on the ground that "all else being equal, the one most widely used is the most valuable." But is this alphabet more widely used than the method of Transliteration into Roman letters of the Sanskrit and allied Alphabets used by the Royal Asiatic Society and adopted by the Geneva Oriental Congress in 1894, which, with very slight variations, is employed by learned individuals and learned societies—as in Prof. Aufrecht's *Rig-Veda Saṁhitá* in Roman character, Sir Monier Williams's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, the transliterations in Sir George Grierson's monumental work, the *Linguistic Survey of India*, the Pali Text Society's publications, and the transcription of many living non-European languages in Roman character? Is it more widely used than the Esperanto alphabet? As to "all else being equal," this can hardly be urged in favour of the phonetic script which has emanated from Paris, in

comparison with the Esperanto alphabet. Serious objections may be urged against the script which, calling itself phonetic, uses the non-phonetic complex symbol æ, drawn from Anglo-Saxon, for expressing the simple a-sound in *bat*, in face of the phonetic symbol æ in Latin, as in the word Cæsar (sounded as Kae-sar), and has so many as 14 characters (including the æ) that are different from Roman characters. Why then not give up Roman characters altogether, and build up an alphabet on the basis of Melville Bell's "Universal Visible Speech Alphabet," in which the letters are so shaped as to show how they are to be sounded. Such a course, though theoretically justifiable, no one would think of practically following. One more remark about the phonetic script, I have to make. No innovation is justifiable which is not demonstrably an improvement. A departure from the venerable ā, ē, ō, &c., to a:, e:, o:, &c., appears to be not justifiable. In the phonetic script "the sign : indicates length and · half-length." Could not the three grades of quantity be indicated thus :—ĕ, e, ē ? If the dotting of letters, as it is done by Orientalists, is objectionable, why should not the putting of a dot or two dots after a vowel be objectionable likewise ? The *soi-disant* International Phonetic Alphabet may be called international in the sense of being now employed by individuals of several nations in the particular field of the study and teaching of phonetics, but it has no chance of being adopted by all

nations to the abandonment of the alphabets they now use.

It is desirable that the leading advocates of phonetic writing in all civilized countries should arrive at a consensus about the representation of simple sounds of human speech by means of Roman characters, and supplementary modified Roman characters, so as to be able to devise a system of phonetic writing that can win its way to universal acceptance. Till the advent of such a system, it would be unwise on the part of any European to attempt Romanizing any non-European system of writing.'

The use of more than two dots for diacritical marking is noway convenient, and one or two dots cannot meet international requirements. Lepsius's Universal Standard Alphabet has so many as 7 variations from r, and so many as 11 from t. I have in this connection a humble suggestion of mine to make, and this is the employment of the mathematical device of using inferior numerical figures, as in the series $a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + \ldots$, the inferior figures being understood to signify varying degrees of affinity to the Roman letters to which they are attached. The English a in *fat* or *bat* is called, according to English practice, the short of a in *fate* (pronounced fēĕt), but this so-called long sound of a is quite different from the Latin long a (ā), and is allied to the Latin e. It would be quite proper, therefore, to write fe_1t for *fat*, if e_1 is taken to represent the variation from the Latin

e-sound, which is equivalent to the a-sound in *fat*. Lepsius's representation of this sound by $\genfrac{}{}{0pt}{}{a}{e}$ seems to be based on the fact of the sound being written with a in English, while it is allied to the sound of the Latin e. In Bengali, the letter এ, of which the usual sound is e or ē, has acquired in the word এক, the a-sound in *fat*; and the ে form of এ in দেখা has also acquired this sound. The compound character ্যা, of which the proper sound is yā or iā has, also acquired the sound.

I have selected inferior figures instead of figures used in the manner of indices, because indices denote quantitative relations of a particular character, which inferior figures do not; and also because, if necessary, the numerical figures $_1$, $_2$, $_3$ &c. put up as indices and denoting *power*, in a sense different though from what the word bears in Mathematics, might be employed to indicate the five grades of sounds assigned to vowels by Dr. Sweet, who says, however, that for practical purposes three grades would suffice. Dr. Sweet's charge against dots that they are "inconspicuous" cannot be urged against inferior numerical figures, and one thing in their favour is that their employment would render the casting of new types unnecessary. If the Lepsian $\genfrac{}{}{0pt}{}{a}{e}$, $\genfrac{}{}{0pt}{}{a}{o}$ and $\genfrac{}{}{0pt}{}{e}{o}$ are permissible, I see no reason why a_1, a_2, d_1, d_2, etc. should be not only permissible, but considered preferable. The inferior figures, $_1$, $_2$, $_3$ etc., are intended to be used for denoting gradually decreasing affinity between non-Latin simple sounds and the

nearest Latin sound expressed by a Roman letter. The ascertainment of the varying degrees of affinity would be attended with difficulty in certain cases. This difficulty, it would be for phoneticians to overcome in the best way they can.

The Rev. J. Knowles does not show himself an advocate of phonetic transcription in Roman or in his Romanic character, but such transcription is a thing needed for languages like Bengali which are not phonetically, but conventionally written. Phonetic writing has still many powerful opponents, among whom have ranked men of Lord Rosebery's calibre. I am glad, however, to be able to quote here the verdict of the eminent English journalist, Sir Harry Johnston, as pronounced in his article "Our Faulty Education" in the *Review of Reviews* for August 1916. "Sooner or later, however, English, like all other surviving languages, will have to be spelt according to one universal phonetic system. We cannot much longer put up with the time-wasting nonsense of the non-correspondence between the use of letters and the sounds they are intended to represent, whether this be continued in French, Russian, Irish, Welsh or English—the chief offenders against such a commonsense prescription." Sir Harry further says that after the standardization of the pronunciation of a language, "we must desire a clear, yet simple phonetic system of transliteration. There is no special need to make any special search for such a system : one that is practically uniform has long been in

existence for the transliteration of African and Oriental languages. It requires only a little simplification."

The Rev. J. Knowles's scheme of Romanization has been before the British and the Indian public for about seven years. For a longer period than this there has been before the Indian public an active propaganda for making Devanagari or Devanagar a common script for all Indian languages. An eminent Indian gentleman, Mr. Sarada Charan Mitra, ex-Judge of the Calcutta High Court, was the originator of the propaganda, and he actively carried it on till his recent lamented death. I regret to have to say of the scheme of my eminent friend that it rests on a sentimental, and not a utilitarian, basis, and that, if it could be successful, it would only prolong the reign of non-phonetic writing and retard the prevalence of a common phonetic alphabet all over the world. A single illustration will make this clear. The Bengali word দক্ষিণ (sounded dokkhin), if transformed into दक्षिण, would continue to be sounded dokkhin in Bengali though the proper sound of दक्षिण is dakṣiṇa.

6. THE UNDESIRABILITY OF DEVANAGARI BEING ADOPTED AS THE COMMON SCRIPT FOR ALL INDIA

From the Modern Review for April 1918.

I concluded my article on the Rev. J. Knowles's scheme for the Romanization of all Indian writing in the *Modern Review* for February 1918, with the remark that the movement for making Devanagari one common script for all the Indian languages rested on a sentimental, and not on a utilitarian, basis, and that, if successful, it would prolong the reign of non-phonetic writing. As the Devanagari movement has a considerable number of supporters in the country, counting even some Musalmans, as I learn, among the number, I think it proper to discuss the question fully in the pages of the *Modern Review.*

When such a revolutionary change as the change of the alphabet current among a people is sought to be effected, the aim should be to institute along with the change a phonetic system of spelling. The displacement of all conventional methods of spelling by a phonetic method is a highly desirable object. All writing must have been originally phonetic. It is only because the written forms of words have not always changed *pari passu* with the change of the sounds of words, that conventional methods of spelling have come into existence. Conventional methods of spelling

have their support in the natural disposition of the great majority of mankind to keep things as they are, in the predilection of the learned for such spelling as suggests the derivation of a word, and, above all, in the stupidity which widely prevails among men and prevents a revolt against systems of non-phonetic spelling which are a galling yoke upon the nations among whom they are current. Many clever men have their conservative instincts so strong that they make themselves the champions of the outworn and the useless; but the great strength of the conservative party arises from the entire body of stupid people, who form the majority of mankind, being naturally conservative, so that, in spite of the marked cleverness of many conservatives, the *conservative party* may justly be called "the stupid party," as John Stuart Mill called it. Learning delights in such unreasonable spelling as 'doubt,' which suggests the affinity of the word to the Latin words *dubitare* and *dubius*. All learning is not however on the side of conventional spelling, which is usually given the dignified name of "historical spelling," though it can ill claim that name, for while it sticks to the written forms that large numbers of words acquired at some particular period of the history of a language, it ignores the changed sounds of the words in later times, and so does not bring up the history of the words to the latest day.

Among modern European languages, Italian and German are very nearly, if not entirely, phonetically

written. The living Indian language, Hindi, is very nearly phonetically written, and the dead Indian language, Pali, which has a rich literature, was also phonetically written. Not only were words in common use, such as *dhamma*, written by Pali writers as they were spoken by speakers of Pali, without any regard for the corresponding Sanskrit word *dharma* or *dharmma*, but Sanskrit words of even a learned character were equally disregarded, and *kammadhāraya* and *bahubbīhi*, for instance, were written for the Sanskrit words *karmadháraya* and *bahuvrīhi*, respectively. *Dhammo* is the popular Bengali word for *dharmma* or *dharma*, and for one Bengali who calls Dhurrumtollah Dharmotalā twenty call it Dhammotalā. But where is the Bengali who should venture to write ধম্মোতলা instead of ধর্ম্মতলা, or to write বদ্দোমান instead of বর্দ্ধমান, though বদ্দোমান (Baddomān) is the current popular name of Burdwan, which is but the Hindustani name of the town, बर्दवान written in the English way. I, for one, feel humiliated to think of the slavish subserviency of the Bengali mind to Sanskrit spelling in contrast with the freedom from all such subserviency which characterized the writers in Pali. The rise of a new religion, Buddhism, which addressed itself to the masses, was the instrument which emancipated the minds of the propagators of this religion from subserviency to the learned language, Sanskrit, and made them employ the current speech

for the propagation of the new faith. The vernacular, Pali, received an impetus similar to that given to German by the Protestant movement initiated by Luther.

The Pali alphabet rejected characters that represented sounds wanting in the Pali language. ऋ, ॠ, ऌ, ॡ, ऐ, औ, श, and ष were the characters it rejected, and it rejected also the *visarga* symbol :. It retained, however, the Vedic ळ, whose sound existed in the Pali language. The Hindi word ताड़ी (toddy) appears to be connected, through ताळ with ताल.

The following list of ten selected words, Sanskrit, Pali, Bengali (as written), and Bengali (as sounded), will show how emancipated were Pali writers from slavish subjection to Sanskrit orthography, which still rests as a heavy burden upon the people of Bengal.

	Sanskrit	Pali	Bengali as written	Bengali as sounded
1.	Abhavya	abhabbo	abhabya	abhobbo
2.	aśubha	asubho	aśubha	aśubho
3.	Baddha	baddho	baddha	baddho
4.	Bhinna	bhinno	bhinna	bhinno
5.	Bhojya	bhojjo	bhojya	bhojjo
6.	Brahma	brahmo	brahma	Brammho
7.	Chhinna	chhinno	chhinna	chhinno
8.	Datta	datto	datta	datto
9	Dātavya	dātabbo	dātabya	dātobbo
10.	Jvālā	jālā	jbā'ā	jā'ā

Bengali not being a phonetically written language, a change from Bengali to Devanagari script would

keep up the non-phonetic character of Bengali writing. I repeat here the single illustrative example I gave in my last February article as sufficient for making this matter clear. The Bengali word for *south* is *dokkhin*. This word as written in Bengali character is দক্ষিণ, which corresponds with the Sanskrit word दक्षिण, letter for letter, but while দক্ষিণ is pronounced as dokkhin, दक्षिण, rightly pronounced, is dakṣiṇa. If দক্ষিণ were transformed into दक्षिण, it would continue to be pronounced dokkhin in Bengal, for with a change of script no one would bring about a change of sound. The word দক্ষিণ, if written दक्षिण, would generally be pronounced as dakṣiṇa outside Bengal, and as dacchin or dakkhin among the Hindi-speaking people of India. The word देवनागरी itself is Devanāgarī in Sanskrit, Deonāgrī in Hindi, and Debnāgrī in Bengali.

Sanskrit is mispronounced in Bengal, as Latin is in England, where, however, has recently sprung up a reform movement in the matter. A change of the Bengali script into Devanagari would lend a fresh support to the mispronunciation of Sanskrit in Bengal and make any reform of this mispronunciation tremendously difficult.

When an alphabet current among a people is sought to be changed, the new alphabet selected for adoption should be as nearly perfect as possible and also one that would correspond, so far as is possible, with the most widely current alphabet in the world. There

is no reason why an alphabet should be *national*, and not *international*. If one alphabet for an entire country, which, by the way, may be divided into many languages as is India, is considered desirable as being helpful to intercourse throughout the country, why should not one alphabet for all the world be considered still more desirable, on the ground of its being promotive of intercourse over the widest possible area, namely, the entire surface of the world accessible to human beings? A script common to several languages cannot indeed in itself be an inducement to one speaking any of these languages to learn any other among them. English, French, Italian and Spanish are all printed in Roman character. But one born to any of these four languages is not induced to learn any of the others because of this. Only if he has occasion to learn any of the others, community of script can come in as a help to him. Tamil, if presented in Devanagari character, cannot be an inducement to any Bengali or Hindustani to learn Tamil, in the absence of any specific need for a knowledge of Tamil. Such need can be but infinitesimally small to Bengalis and Hindustanis at large, in comparison with their need of learning English.

Indo-Romanic is the name applied by Sir Monier Williams to Roman letters arranged in the Devanagari alphabetic order. This name may well be applied to an alphabet built up with the small Roman characters, supplemented according to need, and arranged in the

manner of the letters of the Devanagari alphabet. Such alphabet would be a blend of Indian and Roman elements, and so entitled to the name Indo-Romanic. If all Indian languages were written and printed in such Indo-Romanic character the benefit to Indians would be far wider than if they were all written and printed in Devanagari, for a knowledge of the Indo-Romanic character would be helpful to Indians in acquiring a knowledge of English, which is of inestimable value to them, and in acquiring also the two other great languages of the world, German and French, each of which puts forth year by year a large body of new knowledge before the world. The Indo-Romanic representative of a non-Devanagari Indian character, it would scarcely be harder to learn than the Devanagari representative of it. For instance, the Indo-Romanic representative, k, of the Bengali letter ক, it would scarcely be harder to learn than to learn क, the Devanagari representative of ক.

One notable advantage of the Indo-Romanic character in writing all the Indian vernaculars would be that it would facilitate the acquisition of every Indian vernacular by Englishmen, and would enable those Englishmen who have to do judicial or administrative work in India to read with facility papers written in any Indian vernacular, which would be a material help towards the efficient performance of judicial and administrative functions in the country. Sir Alfred Croft, retired Director of Public Instruction,

Bengal, in a letter written to me from England on the 24th July, 1910, wrote thus :—"Bengali I learnt in the orthodox way—character and language together ; but when I came to learn Hindustani, I learnt it through Forbes' and Tweedie's handbooks, in which progressive exercises are given in double columns (1) English, (2) Hindustani exactly transliterated in Roman character. Hence I was able to speak Hindustani grammatically and with fair fluency before I learnt anything of the character. And then with that basis to go upon, the learning of the character was a very easy matter." Would not Englishmen who have to learn any Indian language other than Hindustani hail it as a blessing if there existed handbooks for teaching that other language such as exist for teaching Hindustani, handbooks that would contain progressive exercises in Indo-Romanic character phonetically employed ?

Those who seek to make Devanagari the one Indian script cannot certainly have the aspiration to get it accepted as the common script for all the world. Devanagari has indeed many points of clear superiority over all the alphabets of the world that are foreign to India, with the exception only of the now defunct Zend alphabet, which is closely analogous to it. But it has many serious defects, among which is its syllabic method of writing.

The merits of the Devanagari alphabet are the following :—

1. The vowels are all put together first, and they are (excepting the single disputable case of उ*) scientifically arranged in accordance with the seats of utterance in the mouth, proceeding from the throat onwards to the lips, causing thus the guttural sounds to come first, and to be followed in order by the palatal, the front-palatal (usually called the cerebral and sometimes also the lingual), the dental and the labial. The vowels are also distinguished into short and long, the long ones being differentiated from the short ones by certain appendages added, but not by one uniform appendage, which is certainly a defect.

2. The consonants, like the vowels, are scientifically arranged with reference to the seats of utterance in the mouth. First come the gutturals, the order being a hard guttural followed by the same guttural aspirated, then the corresponding soft-guttural followed by the same guttural aspirated and then the guttural nasal, the five letters forming what is called a *varga*. The first *varga* which is guttural is followed in gradual succession by four other *vargas*, the palatal, the front-palatal or cerebral, the dental, and the labial, formed precisely on the same model as the guttural *varga*. After the five *vargas*

* उ is justly held to be a labial, leaving aside ए, ऐ, ओ and औ, which were originally sounded as ai, āi, au and āu, respectively, and so were all diphthongs; ऋ and ऌ are unquestionably cerebrals. These cerebrals cannot properly come, it may be said, after the labial उ. But ऋ and ऌ are not pure vowels, but are only semi-vowels with consonantal elements in them. This very probably caused their being put after the pure vowel उ.

come the four liquids running in the order of palatal, front-palatal or cerebral, dental and labial; and finally comes the aspirate letter corresponding to h, which belongs to the guttural class.

In the Devanagari alphabet, as it has historically come down to us, the vowels are followed by certain symbols bearing sounds which can follow but not precede vowel sounds, differing thus from ordinary consonants, which can both precede and follow vowels. These symbols are ˙ and : called *anusvára* and *visarga* respectively, which are still in use, and ✕ and ⩙ called respectively *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya*, which have fallen into disuse. It is quite proper that the symbols ˙ and : should have a place, as of old, between the vowels and the consonants, and not a place after the regular consonants, as in the *Elementary Sanskrit Grammar* brought out by the Calcutta University, for they are not full-power consonants capable of both preceding and following vowels, but are only capable of following vowels. It is doubtful what the original sound of the *visarga* was. In the dictionary order of the Nagari letters in Monier Williams's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, 1888, it is said of the symbol ˙ that it is "either the true *anusvāra*, sounded like *n* in French *mon*, or the symbol of any nasal." I hold the view that the "true *anusvāra*" is a vowel-nasalising symbol ᵕ or ˜,* as the *visarga*

* The mystic monosyllable ओं (whatever its primary sound may be) has to be admitted as very ancient. It has its variants in ओम् (ōm) and ओङ् (ōṅ) [in ओङ्कार ōṅkāra]. ओं is written in Bengali character as ওঁ and this ওঁ is pronounced, not as ō but as ōṅ. The ˙ ᵕ sound appears to have given rise to the m and n-sounds.

is a vowel-aspirating symbol. I sought the help of two deep Sanskrit scholars about the primary sound of the *anusvāra*, but no help came.

The Devanagari alphabet furnishes abundant evidence of the extraordinary acumen of its originators in the discrimination of sounds. The classing of vowels separately from consonants and the arrangement of both vowels and consonants in accordance with a uniform and strictly scientific principle was in itself a mighty achievement. Further, the nice discrimination made between sounds that are closely alike is another point that loudly calls for praise. The nice shades of difference between the sounds indicated by ञ, ण, and न, it was not easy to note, as also the nice shade of difference between the sounds of श, and ष. ञ has the sound of n in *fringe*, ण, the sound of n in *land* and *burn*, and न the sound n in *net* and *ten*. How many are the Englishmen who know that there is any difference between the sounds of n in *fringe*, *land* and *net*, or that there is any difference of sound between sh in *show* and sh in *fish*, which is the difference between the श-sound and the ष-sound?

Great as are the merits of the Devanagari alphabet, it is not without its defects:—

1. Its vowel-system is faulty and poor in comparison with certain other languages, Bengali, for instance, and English. Further, the long vowels are not distinguished from the corresponding short vowels by one uniform mark or symbol. There are as many

marks as there are vowels, with the exception only of the diphthongal vowels, ऐ and औ, which have a mark in common. Multiplicity of means for effecting one and the same object is entirely a defect. The vowels अ, आ, इ, ई, उ, ऊ (a, ā, i, ī, u, ū) are in regular order, though a remark is needed here in regard to the letter अ, the modern sound of which is that of u in *sun* or *hut*, and not the short sound corresponding to the long sound expressed by आ, which is that of a in *father*. After अ, आ, इ, ई, उ, ऊ come the so-called vowels ऋ, ॠ, ऌ, ॡ (the last regarded as "a grammatical invention", and not the representative of a real sound). These letters are usually transliterated into ṛi, ṛī, ḷi, ḷī. The transliterations ṛi, ṛī, ḷi, ḷī carry with them evidence of their origin in Bengal, where they are pronounced as downright ri, rī, li, lī. Had the letters been first transliterated in Upper India, ऋ would have been turned into iṛ and ऌ into iḷ, or perhaps into ĭṛ and ĭḷ, respectively, to show the extreme shortness of the vowel sound i preceding the r and l-sounds, as pronounced in Upper India. The real character of the two sounds appears to be an extremely short vowel sound (the sound of what has been called the indeterminate vowel) followed, respectively, by the consonantal sounds r and l, perhaps slightly modified. They are no more vowel sounds than are the 'r-sound in the Hindustani patronymic *Misr* and in the Arabic word *fikr*, and the 'l-sound in the English words *muddle* and *battle*. If the Sanskrit

language had contained a sound analogous to that of en in *garden* and of on in *poison*, there would in all likelihood have been in the Devanagari alphabet another vowel on the basis of the न (n)-sound. The reckoning of ऋ and ऌ as vowels is a proof of extraordinary acumen on the part of the person who first reckoned them as such. In the absence of the idea of an indeterminate vowel, the sounds they represent would naturally suggest themselves as vowel sounds, for they can each form a syllable by itself. That in ऋ, ॠ, ऌ, ॡ a vowel sound *precedes* and does not *follow* the r and l-sounds is made demonstrably clear by the गुण (guṇa) forms अर् (ar) and अल् (al), and the वृद्धि (vriddhi) forms आर् (ār) and आल् (āl), of the letters. But when the alternative spellings, क्रिमि for कृमि and पैत्रिक for पैतृक came to be used, the idea must have arisen that the vowel sound follows the r-sound. The letters can at most be regarded as semi-vowels, and so the inclusion of them among vowels is a defect. The vowels that follow them in the Devanagari alphabet, ए, ऐ, ओ and औ were originally all diphthongs, sounded as ai, āi, au and āu, respectively. ए is now sounded as ē, and ओ, as ō. ऐ, now sounded as ai, cannot, therefore, possibly be the long of ए sounded as ē. Similarly औ, now sounded as au, cannot possibly be the long of ओ sounded as ō. Diphthongal characters are superfluities, and so a defect in an alphabet.

The Devanagari vowels have their full forms only when they are initial and make a syllable each. When following any consonant they have, with the exception of अ, which is held to be inherent in the consonant it follows, forms different, more or less, from their full forms. Including the semi-vowels, the forms are ा for आ, ि for इ, ी for ई, ु for उ, ू for ऊ, ृ for ऋ, ॄ for ॠ, ॢ for ऌ, ॣ for ॡ, े for ए, ै for ऐ, ो for ओ, and ौ for औ. This certainly is a defect, and seems to be confirmatory evidence of the hypothesis of the Semitic origin of the Indian alphabets, for in all Semitic writing vowels have a subordinate position in comparison with consonants.

The Devanagari alphabet, as at present used, has the following simple vowel sounds :—a (=u in *hut*), ā (=a in *father*), i, ī, u, ū, ē, ō. There are besides the recognized diphthongal sounds ai and au. There are also other diphthongal sounds produced with the semi-vowels य and व, as in the words पर्यटन (paryaṭana =pari+aṭana) and पश्वादि (pas'vādi=pas'u+ādi).

The vowels of the Devanagari alphabet are insufficient for the representation of all the vowel sounds of the Bengali language, and so in Bengali writing, which is done with characters entirely analogous to those of the Devanagari alphabet, one character has to do duty for the representation of more than one sound. The simple sounds of the Bengali language that cannot be represented by Devanagari, and so by corresponding Bengali characters, are, leaving out

of account the long and short sounds of vowels, the following :—the আ-sound in আজ (to-day), the first এ-sound in মেজে (floor), the এ-sound in এক and the ও-sound in বো-নে (bride). Of these the most important sound is the এ-sound in এক. The difference between the long and short sounds of vowels being taken into account, আ cannot be said to represent the long অ-sound in অকাল, and এ cannot be said to represent the short vowel sound of ে in দেনা or of য় in হয়.

The clear English vowel sounds that cannot be represented by Devanagari characters are the following :—The sound of a in *ball*, the sound of a in *hat*, the sound of e in *net*, the sound of o in *not*, the sound of au in *taught*, and the sound of the first o in *promote*. The obscure vowel sounds of e in *her* and of i in *sir* are here left out of account.

To come now to the Devanagari consonants. The second and fourth letters of each of the *vargas* are unnecessary, as being compounds of the respective preceding unaspirated letter (*minus* its inherent अ) and ह. ख is a compound of क् and ह, घ of ग् and ह, छ of च् and ह, झ of ज् and ह, ठ of ट् and ह, ढ of ड् and ह, थ of त् and ह, ध of द् and ह, फ of प् and ह, भ of ब् and ह. European scholars who have never been in India have a very incorrect apprehension of the aspirated or mahāprāṇa (great breath) consonants as they are called. Max Müller, in his *Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners*, 1866, p. 8, pronounces the opinion expressed

by European scholars who have learnt in India, that the sound of ख is almost like that of kh in '*inkhorn*,' "a somewhat exaggerated description." Monier Williams in the Preface to his *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, 1888, p. xxix, delivers himself more dogmatically thus:—"The fact, of course, is that an aspirated consonant is merely a consonant pronounced with an emphatic emission of the breath much as an Irishman pronounces p in *penny*." The late Mr. John Beames was an eminent scholar who studied Indian languages in India and had a deep knowledge of some of them. Nevertheless he fell into the error of regarding ख and the other aspirated consonants as not compound of क् and ह and so on. In his *Comparative Grammar of the Aryan Languages of India*, Vol. I, pp. 264-265, he says:—"The aspirates, it must, however, be remembered, are never considered as mere combinations of an ordinary letter with h. It is quite a European idea so to treat of them; kh is not a k-sound followed by an h, it is uttered with a greater effort of breath than ordinary....there is not the slightest pause or stop between the k and the h, in fact no native ever imagines that there is a k or an h in the sound." He is quite right in saying that there is not the slightest pause between the k and the h, such as there is between the k in *ink* and the h in *horn*, in the compound word 'inkhorn'; and it is this pause that seems to have misled him. He instances the difference between खाओ and क्हाओ as confirmatory evidence of the

correctness of his theory. His failure to notice that खाओ is khāo and कहाओ is kahāo is indeed most extraordinary, and is a proof of the great difficulty that lies in the way of one's catching the sounds of a language that is not one's own. In saying that no native ever imagines that there is a k or an h in the sound of ख, he clean forgot that ख is kh, घ is gh, छ is ch, and so on in Urdu writing in Persi-Arabic character; and Urdu writing suggested to Sir William Jones's mind the idea of transliterating ख as kh, घ as gh, and so on. In Bengali, খ is kh beyond question, as ख is in Hindi and Marathi; and the case is similar with other aspirated Bengali, Hindi and Marathi consonants. This is probably the case also with the other Indo-Aryan languages, but I have no positive knowledge about them.

That the modern sounds of the aspirated consonants, ख, घ, etc., and analogous characters in alphabets allied to the Devanagari, are kh, gh, etc., being admitted, it may be contended that the ancient sounds of the aspirated Indian consonants were different and that these sounds were merely the sounds of the corresponding unaspirated consonants "pronounced with an emphatic emission of the breath." But the Vedic ळ्ह (a compound of ळ and ह), taking, as it does the place of ढ, as ळ does that of ड, stands in the way of this theory, and makes it very probable that the ancient sounds of the aspirated Indian consonants were the same as their modern sounds.

Besides being unnecessary, the characters representing the aspirated consonantal sounds have each the additional defect of being quite different in shape from the characters which represent the corresponding unaspirated consonantal sounds, with the exception only of the characters ठ and फ, which are much like ट and प, respectively. It is certainly very strange that the Hindus, with a full knowledge of the small difference between what they called the अल्पप्राण (small breath) letters and the corresponding महाप्राण (great breath) letters, should have represented them by letters differing widely in shape. There is a lack here of the usual mental acuteness of the organizers of the Indian alphabets. Lack of mental acuteness is also seen in three nasal sounds so nearly related as to be hardly distinguishable from one another being represented by such dissimalar characters as ञ, ण and न, and in two sibilants, very nearly alike in sound, being represented by such dissimilar characters as श and ष. Then again certain conjunct characters क्ष (a compound of क् and ष) and ज्ञ (compound of ज् and ञ) show no elements of even partial likeness to either of the components of which each is made up.

The defects pointed out above are certainly not of a trifling character, and they contrast very unfavourably with the representation of certain kindred sounds by kindred characters in the Arabic alphabet.

The Asoka script or Brahmilipi is the oldest Indian script known. But this script has an antecedent history, and if this history could be traced back,

step by step, to the oldest form of Indian script, the origin of kindred sounds being represented by widely divergent characters might receive an explanation. There is a close correspondence between the Zend alphabet and the Indo-Aryan alphabets, of which Devanagari is the chief representative. This cannot be the result of an accident. I know of no solution offered by scholars of this striking correspondence. The Zend characters with their Roman equivalents given on p. 41 of Trubner's *Grammalography*, 1861, differ in a few cases from those given on p. 252, Vol. II, of Dr. Isaac Taylor's *The Alphabet*, 1883; but they both furnish abundant testimony of the close correspondence of the Zend and Devanagari alphabets.

The Devanagari system of writing makes a short a, i.e. अ, inherent in every consonant which is not marked by a *Virāma* stroke below. The *Virāma* mark has its counterpart in the Persi-Arabic symbol called *jasm* in Persian and Urdu. As the short vowel symbols called *zabar, ser* and *pes'*, in Persian and Urdu, are usually omitted in writing, the result is that a short a, a short i or a short u, as occasion requires, has to be supposed to follow a consonant. This is not exactly analogous to the invariable inherence, in Indian alphabets, of a short a after consonants not marked by a *Virāma* stroke. But this and the use of the *jasm* symbol appear to bear out the theory of the Semitic origin of the Indian alphabets.

In Devanagari writing क् is equivalent to k, क is equivalent to ka, का is equivalent to kā, and क्क is equivalent to kka. One initial objection to this method

of writing is that in का there is nothing to show that the क here is without its inherent अ, that का is in fact क *minus* its inherent अ *plus* आ. Similarly, there is nothing in the क that is on the top of another क to show that it is without its inherent अ. Letting alone this objection, there remain serious objections to the practice of conjoining two or three consonants into a single character, which is incommodious enough in writing and requires in printing an enormously large number of types and has the further practical drawback that the current forms of certain conjunct characters, such as त्त for त्+त, and श्र for श्+र, do not show fully the components of which they are made up. The glaring enigmas, क्ष and ज्ञ, have already been mentioned. The recognition, again, of each conjunct character as a syllable gives rise to an absurd system of syllabification. The word पूर्णचन्द्र, for instance, has to be syllabified as pū-rna-cha-ndra, and not as pūr-na-chan-dra, which is the proper syllabification according to the sound of the word.

The inherent a theory is largely set at nought in Hindi writing, and to a smaller extent in Bengali writing. The general rule in Hindi writing is that every consonant single or conjunct, at the end of a word or syllable, is read as being without its inherent a. In Bengali writing the rule is the same for single consonants, with only a few exceptions; but in the case of conjunct consonants the final inherent a is always sounded. The inherent vowel sound in Bengali is often o, instead

of a, as in the word हरिपद, which is pronounced Horipado.* The convention in Hindi and Bengali writing that the inherent a is sometimes present in and sometimes absent from a consonant is certainly an obstacle in the way of a foreigner learning either of the two languages in which the convention exists. The words अपराध, भगवानदास and गोविन्द would in Sanskrit be sounded, respectively, as aparādha, Bhagavānadāsa and Govinda. The same words, written in the very same way, would in Hindi be sounded as aprādh, Bhagvāndās and Gobind. Written in Bengali character, the words would, for Sanskrit, be sounded as aparādha, Bhagabānadās'a and Gobinda, but, for Bengali, as aprādh or aporādh, Bhagobāndās' and Gobindo respectively. The convention of an inherent a in consonants has thus come to be a practical evil in Hindi and Bengali writing.

Hindi is almost wholly phonetically written. It has a few conventions, however, as in the word written कोयला (koylā) but pronounced koela; and Sanskrit words, such as साहित्य, a necessary importation from Sanskrit, and unnecessary importations from Sanskrit that are being now largely made, such as सूर्य, for the universally used Hindi word सूरज, are pronounced not exactly as they are in Sanskrit,

* Not only the inherent a (অ), but the fully expressed a (অ) has often the o-sound, as in the words অতিশয়, অতুল (proper name), অখিল (proper name).

but modified a bit according to the genius of the Hindi language, which does not tolerate a final a-sound. The Hindustani lexicographer, Mathuraprasad Misr, has put before the world his patronymic as Misr, instead of Misra, in Roman character. The only Hindi word which has clearly a final a-sound is न, sounded as na.

The Devanagari alphabet and the method of writing based upon it, weighted, as they are, with the numerous defects that have been pointed out, cannot claim a world-wide diffusion. Advocacy for their diffusion all over India can rest only on a sentimental, not a utilitarian, basis. The sentimental basis is this. A united Indian nation should have one national alphabet and not a number of alphabets ; and as the Devanagari alphabet is the premier alphabet among the indigenous Indian alphabets, which all run on the lines of Devanagari, and is the medium for the writing and printing not only of Sanskrit over a wide area, but the medium for the writing and printing of Hindi and Marathi likewise, it is fitting that it should supersede all the other Indian alphabets, and so be helpful towards inter-provincial intercourse by facilitating the acquisition, by the people of any linguistic area, of the language spoken over any other linguistic area. The idea of Devanagari as the one common Indian script must naturally be gratifying to many Indian patriots, but many more Indian patriots, I am persuaded, would be for keeping the present state of things undisturbed,

from purely utilitarian considerations. On grounds of utility a supersession of the handier Bengali, Gujarati and Persian characters by Devanagari would manifestly be an evil, and the infliction of such evil for promoting national unity of a hazy character cannot commend itself to a vast body of Indian patriots, among whom I include my humble self. In Indian schools and colleges, Sanskrit is now read in books printed in Devanagari character. But the Calcutta University has not thought it right to impose the hardship of *writing* Sanskrit in Devanagari character upon Bengali and Oriya students, who follow the ancient custom of writing Sanskrit in Bengali and in Oriya character. Any attempt to do away with this privilege would provoke very wide and bitter opposition. If Bengali and Oriya students were allowed the option of writing Sanskrit in either the Devanagari or the Roman character at the University examinations, they would certainly prefer the latter, as it would be the easier of the two for them to write in.

While I am one of the unregenerate who hold that the Bengali, Gujarati, Oriya, Persian and other characters now in use in India should be left undisturbed at present, I am entirely for the formation of an Indo-Romanic alphabet on lines of reform further advanced than those enunciated by the Rev. J. Knowles—an alphabet that would suffice for a phonetic representation, in writing and in printing, of all words in the Indian languages, and would be fitted at the same time

to be the basis of a world-wide universal alphabet. In the case of an Indian language, such as Bengali or Urdu, which is not phonetically written, transliteration, pure and simple, into Roman character cannot answer. Phonetic transcription, which in effect amounts to transliteration with a due recognition of the powers of the Indian letters with which the words are written, is a necessity.

The most important of Indian languages is doubtless Hindustani,* and this language in its Urdu phase, if not in its Hindi phase, is now in some measure printed in Roman character. Usually, however, Urdu is written in Persian character and printed in either Persian or Arabic character, the difference between these two being but small. Now Arabic words are numerous in Persian, and from Persian they have made their way into Urdu. As these words are written and printed

* After Anglo-Indian lexicographers down to Fallon, I use the word Hindustani in the sense of Urdu and Hindi taken together. Forbes's *Hindustani Grammar*, 1862, begins with the following sentence :—"The Hindustani language may be printed and written in two distinct alphabets, *viz.*, the Persi-Arabic, and the Devanagari." The word Hindi is used loosely in several different senses. (1) In the sense of Dr. Hörnle's High Hindi, to denote the language of Hindi prose of the present day, which is the same in its Grammar as Urdu, and different from it only in using very sparingly Persian and Arabic words, which are used very largely in Urdu. (2) In the sense of the language of Tulsidas's *Ramayan*, and of other similar poetry, which is quite a different language from that of modern Hindi prose. (3) In the sense of several rustic dialects. (4) In a sense including High Hindi and Urdu, as in the Census Returns, in which there has been no room for Urdu or Hindustani, as Urdu is usually called. If Hindustani is Hindi, then is English Low German (Nieder Deutsch) and not English; and if Hindustani is not spoken in India (Hindustan). then is English not spoken in England.

in Persian and Urdu just as they are in Arabic, although certain letters in Persian and Urdu have not the same sounds as they have in Arabic, the transliteration of Urdu into Roman character has been attended with certain drawbacks. In Persian and Urdu the letters called *te* and *toe** have both the sound of t (त); the letters called *se* and *sin* have both the sound of s; and the letters called *zāl, ze, zād* and *zoe* have all the sound of z. It is not so, however, in Arabic; and so in Romanized Urdu books we have only the letter called *sin*, which has the s-sound in Arabic, represented by s, and only the letter called *ze*, which has the z-sound in Arabic, represented by z; the other characters concerned being represented by Roman letters bearing diacritical marks intended to indicate their sounds in Arabic. Even in the "Selections from Bagh-o-Bahar (Romanized)", "Published by Authority," 1893, one etter, *zād*, which in Persian and Urdu bears the z-soundl, is represented by dh, so as to make the common words hāzir and huzūr appear as ḥādhir and ḥudhúr. The Arabic letter, *ain*, which has lost its sound in Persian and Urdu, is again represented in Romanized Urdu by an apostrophe ' associated with a vowel, as in the word *b'ād*, pronounced bād, which was at one time written as बअद (the अ being dotted below) in Devanagari character but is now phonetically written as बाद (bād). If, in Romanizing Urdu, the sounds which

* The want of Arabic types in the Press obliges me to give the names of letters instead of the letters themselves.

Persi-Arabic characters have in Urdu were alone taken into account and their sounds in Arabic were altogether ignored, a good deal of unnecessary confusion would be avoided. Phonetic Romanization would be a recognition of things as they are at present ; transliteration into Roman character without a recognition of the difference between the present and the past would be an unreasoning worship of the past.

An Indo-Romanic alphabet with the full complement of consonants required for Hindustani cannot be required for any other Indian language. Each Indian language can appropriate to itself as many letters as it requires. The one thing common to all Indian languages as written or printed would be that the same letter would convey the same sound in all of them. The foreign elementary sounds that have been thoroughly naturalized in Hindustani are five in number, and are written and printed with the dotted Devanagari characters, क़, ख़, ग़, ज़ and फ़. क़दर, ख़रीद, कागज़, ज़मीन and सफ़र are words in which the dotted characters occur. The admission of the five foreign elementary sounds into Hindustani has enriched the language.

In connection with the building up of an Indo-Romanic alphabet on the basis of the small letters of the Roman alphabet, remarks are needed about some of these letters. The dots over i and j are unnecessary, and the letter q is very unlike in form to the letter k, which has a kindred sound. The dots over i and j may, therefore, well be discarded, and the deeply guttural

kāf-sound may well be represented by k marked somehow and not by q. Some lexicographers represent the deeply guttural letter kāf by k dotted below. The small Roman letter g is a complicated character, and so it should give place to the Italic form of g, changed from slant to vertical.

The Royal Asiatic Society's and the other slightly different systems of transliteration into Roman character have not aimed at creating a world-wide alphabet, as is evidenced by the transliteration of different characters bearing different sounds in different languages by the same Roman character diacritically marked in the same way; as the transliteration of the Devanagarı : and the Arabic letter called *he* by ḥ, and of the Devanagarı ष and the Arabic *sād* by ṣ. Lepsius's Standard Alphabet aimed at being a universal alphabet. But being cumbrous, and saddled besides with some Greek letters, it has proved a failure. The International Phonetic Alphabet has gone on the wrong track of departing in a large number of cases from current Roman characters, of calling itself phonetic and yet antiphonetically using the complex symbol æ, drawn from Anglo-Saxon, for indicating the simple vowel sound of a in *hat*—in face of the very proper use of the very same complex symbol in Latin, as in the word *Cæsar* (pronounced Kae-sar)—and following besides the wrong principle of representing kindred sounds by quite unlike characters in the case of the English sh-sound, which is allied to the s-sound. International this Alphabet now is in that it is used by men

of several nationalities in the study and teaching of phonetics. But there is no likelihood of its making its way to universal acceptance, so that Frenchmen, Englishmen, Germans and other nations of the world would ultimately use it, dropping the alphabets they now use. Dotting of letters, otherwise objectionable, cannot be carried far enough to cover the number of variations from the sounds of certain Roman letters that exist in non-Latin languages. In the Lepsian alphabet, the letters r and t particularly have a large number of variations of sounds. Appendages that have been added to certain Roman letters by Pitman and others are cumbrous and so inimical to facile writing and are besides open to the fatal objection that no generally acceptable principle can be fixed upon for the shaping of the appendages. To meet the situation I ventured to suggest, in my last February article in the *The Modern Review*, the use of numerical figures as inferior characters, as in the mathematical series $a_1x+a_2x^2+a_3x^3+a_4x^4+\ldots$, for indicating variations of sounds from Roman letters. All the minor sounds of non-European languages are not known to European scholars, with whom mainly must rest the work of elaborating a phonetic alphabet acceptable to all the world. In a scheme of affiliation of foreign sounds to Latin sounds drawn up after extensive research, there may remain gaps. For instance, after the order t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, has been settled, some sound in some

language may be discovered which has a closer affinity to t than, say, t_1 has. In such a case the order already established should not be disturbed. The new sound should come in at the end of the series established, and be numbered accordingly. The name oxygen has not been changed, although it is now known that the thing called oxygen is not an acid-maker.

In a universal alphabet, letters as written should be as nearly as possible like letters as they are printed, and facility of writing should be a point steadily kept in view. Facility of writing is a special merit of the Persi-Arabic alphabet, and it is very desirable that a universal alphabet should possess this characteristic. It should, of course, not have the encumbrance of capital letters different in shape from small letters. C,c and S,s supply models for capital letters and small letters all round.

The naming of the letters of an alphabet is an important question. About the naming of the vowels there is no great difficulty in the way. The natural course is to name them after their respective sounds. This natural course has, however, not been followed by all peoples. The English-speaking peoples, for instance, give the names of i and u diphthongal sounds, and the name of y a triphthongal sound. Confusion is caused again in English by a, e, i, o and u not having always the sounds of their names. The only practical difficulty about the naming of the vowels is the fixing of the quantity of the vowel in the name. The quantity

may very properly be the medium quantity of Dr. Sweet.* A short vowel sound for the name of a vowel would not answer well.

The consonants of the Devanagari alphabet all end with the a-sound, of the French alphabet with the e-sound, and of the Esperanto alphabet with the o-sound. In English and German there is no uniformity in the naming, though in the former the i-sound following is the predominant characteristic, and in the latter the e-sound. The letters f, l, m, n, s in both English and German begin their names with the e-sound, and for the English name, *eks*, of x, the German name is *iks*. The consonantal sound *followed* by a vowel sound does not show in full the character of a consonantal sound, and so also does not a consonantal sound *preceded* by a vowel sound. A combination of both *following* and *preceding* would give a perfect method of naming consonants. क or k would thus be named *kak*; ग or g would be named *gag*; ङ or ṅ would be named *ṅaṅ*; and so on. This system of naming would be a very desirable reform, as it would enable even a little child to seize the full significance of a consonantal sound.

---

* For practical convenience it seems desirable that in ordinary writing and printing the quantity of vowels should not be marked. In books meant for elementary instruction and in dictionaries quantity requires to be indicated. Dr. Sweet very accurately enunciates "five degrees of quantity:" very long, long, half-long or medium, short, very short; but "for practical purposes", says he, "the three-fold distinction of long, half-long and short is generally enough." The name 'medium', as signifying neither long nor short, seems preferable to 'half-long'.

I am no advocate of the dotting of letters, as I have said before. But as dotting is now largely in occupation of the field, I give below, in orthodox dotting fashion, a tentative Indo-Romanic alphabet for writing phonetically the Hindustani or Hindusthani language, which is decidedly the premier language in India. Hindustani has been Indianized into Hindusthani in Bengal, and it is desirable that the Indianized name should drive out of the field the Persian name. In my Indo-Romanic alphabet for Hindustani, I do not adhere strictly to the Royal Asiatic Society's system of transliteration, and I do not indicate the quantity of the vowels in the orthodox way as short and long, for I think it needful that Dr. Sweet's three-fold distinction of short, medium and long should take the place of the short and long. Taking the vowel, a, as an example, its short, medium and long sounds may be represented as ă, a, ā. The medium sound is very common in Bengali. The Bengali দিন should properly be transliterated as *din*, and the Hindi दिन as *dĭn*, the i-sound here being as short as the i-sound in the English word *din*. The Bengali i-sound in দীনবন্ধু though written long, is really medium. The old Indian distinction between ह्रस्व (short), दीर्घ (long) and प्लुत (prolated) does not appear to exactly correspond with Dr. Sweet's three-fold distinction. The प्लुत appears to indicate a diphthongal sound, like the vowel sound in the English word *slow*, the sound of which English lexicographers usually give as slō, instead of slōŏ.

The Tentative Indo-Romanic Alphabet.

I. Vowels—a_1 for अ * ; a for आ ; i for इ, ई ; u for उ, ऊ ; e for य as a vowel (as in the word कोयला) and for ए ; o for ओ (long, medium and short) ; ' for the indeterminate vowel (for expressing sounds like कृत (k'rt) in तुलसीकृत रामायण.

Vowels nasalized—$\tilde{a}_1$, ã, ĩ. etc.

Vowels aspirated—a_1ḥ, aḥ, iḥ, etc.

II. Consonants—k for क्; k (dotted below) for क़्; <u>kh</u> for ख़् (a compound sound this) ; g for ग्; g (dotted below) for ग़्; ṅ for ङ्; c for च्; j for ज्; z for ज़्; n̲ for ञ ; ṭ for ट्; ḍ for ड्; ḍ$_1$ *or* n̲ for ड़्; ṇ for ण्; t for त्; d for द्; n for न्; p for प्; f *or* p_1h for फ़्; b for ब्; m for म्; ṣ for श्, ष्; s for स्, h for ह्. kh, gh, ch, etc. to perform the same functions as now.

I have a word to say in explanation of my use of p_1h for expressing the f-sound. The Greek *theta*, the Arabic letter called *se* in Persian and Urdu, and the English th (in *thin*) have all the same sound. The sound is expressed by means of a single letter in Greek and Arabic, but by means of a combination of two letters, t and h, in English. Which is the right method? I hold the heterodox view that the English method is the right one, for the sound is a compound one. I would represent the sound by t_1h. The t-sound here does not exist indeed by itself, i.e., unattended by the

*Want of Arabic types in the Press makes omission of Arabic equivalents of Devanagari letters here a necessity.

h-sound in Greek, Arabic or English, but it is pronounceable by itself. If sounds are to be analysed in a thorough-going manner, t_1h for the English th in *thin* would be justifiable, as also p_1h for f, the German v and the Arabic *fe*. This heterodox view can have but a hostile reception.

---

7. SELF-DETERMINATION AS THE BASIS OF A JUST PEACE

From the Modern Review for February 1919.

Self-determination has been proclaimed as one of the basic principles of the just peace settlement which, under the noble leadership of President Wilson, is expected to put an end to war for ever, or, at any rate, to make it all but impossible in the future. But a good deal of difficulty seems to lie in the way of the principle being equitably applied. The fact is, a high sense of equity has not yet developed itself among the statesmen of the world, and so self-seeking impulses in Bohemia and France have been making head against the self-determination of the German-speaking population of Bohemia and of German Austria.

In *The Englishman* of the 27th December 1918 and of the 1st January 1919, respectively, have been published the two following Reuter's telegrams marked here (1) and (2).

(1) Amsterdam, Dec. 18. A telegram from Prague says: Doctor Karamarez, Premier of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, replying to the German Deputation said that the Entente had alloted the whole of Bohemia to the Czecho-Slovak State. The ideal of self-determination belonged to the future and would not apply to Bohemia.

(2) Paris, Dec. 30. In the Chamber of Deputies yesterday M. Pichon in the course of a speech said

he did not want a policy of annexation but he reserved entire liberty concerning the frontiers of Alsace-Lorraine. Continuing, the Foreign Minister said Germany was conquered but not crushed and she must be prevented from finding compensation for her losses in German Austria......

M. Franklin Boullon, President of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said the Saar mining basin must be included in Alsace-Lorraine.

It is scarcely intelligible how, in face of the self-determination proclamation of President Wilson, the Entente Powers could have decided on placing the Germans of Bohemia, who are locally separable from their Czech neighbours and who long to be united to Germany, under the yoke of the Czechs. The word 'Entente' in the telegram appears not to include the United States, and the Entente's alleged misdoing cannot apparently be endorsed by the United States at the Peace Conference.

France wants to rectify the frontiers of Alsace-Lorraine by including within it the Saar coal valley. This would be a bit of annexation, if, as is plain enough, the valley was out of Alsace-Lorraine when Germany annexed the province in 1871. But this is but a small matter, and cannot, therefore, cause any practical difficulty.

German-Austrians naturally seek to be united to the other Germans, and France, from a selfish desire to keep Germans divided and weak, wants to

prevent this. In Napoleon's time France played well the game of keeping Germans divided and weak, and she is trying to play the same game now. But German unity is bound to come, soon or late.

Germany's endeavour to dominate the world and extend the bounds of her empire by means of a terrific and cruel war has doubtless been a thoroughly criminal enterprise of hers. She sought conquest on the basis of a most elaborate scale of preparations such as the world had never before seen, and most ruthlessly carried on the war, which she brought upon the world. But in the matter of conquest by force of arms, even the foremost of her adversaries have not been blameless; they made their conquests, however, in a quieter way. Britain's recent conquests embrace Upper Burma and vast stretches of territory in Africa; France, after the overthrow of her military supremacy by Germany in 1871, conquered a large part of Indo-China, the Island of Madagascar, and vast stretches of territory in Continental Africa, Italy, the latest sinner in the matter of forcible appropriation of foreign territory, seized Tripoli on the flimsiest of pretexts; finally, the United States of America, which now avows the principle of not seeking to acquire by force of arms a single square foot of foreign territory, did, rather long ago, wrest from Mexico a large part of her territory, and only twenty years ago conquered from Spain the rich and well-peopled island of Porto Rico.

In the course of the war just ended the Germans inflicted a vast deal of misery upon the world and caused immense loss to the Allies. Adequate pecuniary compensation may justly be exacted from them, to the utmost extent of their resources. But to deprive any section of Germans of the privilege of self-determination would be most unjust. And it would be unjust likewise, the present writer holds, to deprive Germany of her colonies, Kiau-Chau alone being excepted. Kiau-Chau, being a part of a civilized and now progressive country, should justly belong to that country, on the principle of self-determination, which cannot be applied to the other German colonies, for their inhabitants cannot be set up as independent communities in any way.

It is maintained that Germany's colonies should not be restored to her for the two following reasons. (1) Cruel German misgovernment in the past. (2) Australia's, South Africa's and New Zealand's strong dislike of the neighbourhood of German colonies as being sources of danger to them. Now, if misgovernment in the past be a valid reason for severance of connection between the governed and the governors, then Belgian Congo should sever her connection with Belgium—nay, even Ireland should, as Irish Republicans desire, sever her connection with England. Germany's colonies may well be restored to her under effective guarantees of good rule in future. To deprive so highly gifted and so numerically strong a nation

as the Germans of all fields of colonial enterprise would be bad statesmanship, after all. Deprivation could only increase, particularly in Belgian Congo and Angola, the pressure of pacific penetration, in which the Germans have proved themselves such adepts, and would leave a festering sore in the hearts of Germans, such as the unjust and unwise German annexation of Alsace-Lorraine left in the hearts of Frenchmen. It would again, like deprivation of the privilege of self-determination, be a strong barrier against Germany's joining the desired League of Nations. The English-speaking, the German-speaking, and the French-speaking races are now the foremost races of men in the world, and it is in every way desirable that these three races should in the future work harmoniously together for the good of the world. There are indeed certain serious defects in the German character. It has still too much of the old Teutonic savage spirit, in spite of Germany's great intellectual advance. The savage instincts must wear out in time.

It is simply absurd for Australia, South Africa and New Zealand to urge that they cannot bear the neighbourhood of petty German colonies, in face of the fact that England and France cannot possibly avoid the neighbourhood of Germany herself.

If the Peace Conference does after all deprive Germany of her African and Pacific colonies, should they go to increase the already enormous expanse of the British Empire? This would be most

undesirable for the reason that Britain and her allies went forth to the war with a disclaimer of all desire for territorial conquest. The wrested German colonies would best be jointly administered by Britain, the United States, France and Italy. As a loyal British subject I cannot bear the idea of Britain's getting a stain on her honour by the annexation of any of Germany's colonies. Such annexation would be but a prolongation of the old regime of conquest by force of arms, of the horrors of which in full measure the world has just had a most painful experience. All the best minds in the world can only wish that the cursed regime should now have its death-stroke.

---

8. THE INTERNATIONAL PHONETIC SCRIPT

From the Modern Review for May 1919.

"There are many phonetic alphabets; all else being equal, the one most widely used is clearly the most valuable. We have therefore chosen for this book the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association, which is already well known in England.. It will commend itself by its great simplicity." So writes Mr. Walter Rippmann, M. A., in his *Sounds of Spoken English* (New Version, 1914, p. 23). Why should there be many phonetic alphabets, all based though on the Roman? Would it not be a gain to the world if the leading schools of phonetic writing in Europe and America arrived at a consensus about the representation of simple sounds of human speech by means of small Roman characters and supplementary modified small Roman characters, so that a phonetic system of writing might be devised which could win its way to universal acceptance? On obvious grounds of utility capital letters must be discarded.

The three prominent schools of phonetic writing at present are the following:—(1) Orientalists who follow the system of transliteration which has come down from the time of Sir William Jones, receiving slight modifications from time to time, and which has been employed in transliterating Oriental writing and

should be of a simple and uniform character. Dotting is historically the oldest method of modification. It is simple enough, but it has been objected to as being inconspicuous.* A far more serious objection is that the use of more than two dots is noway convenient, and two dots cannot satisfy international requirements An international alphabet must have a stock of letters sufficient for all human languages. It must have symbols besides for indicating Mongolian intonations and Hottentot clicks.

Extension of a method of modification which has been adopted by both the International Phonetic Association and a section of Orientalists may perhaps have a favourable consideration from both the schools. The same symbol is used by the International Phonetic Association and by Orientalists of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for signifying the English ng-sound in *king* which is wanting in Latin. Now this symbol is but n with a little curve ending in a dot attached at the end. Nay, the Roman letter a itself has a similar appendage at the top. An extension of the method of attaching a dot-ended curve, as shown below, may not be unacceptable to the International Phoneticians and the Orientalists. The letter d with its dental Italian sound, which is the same as that of the Devanagari द, being taken into consideration, there are, within my knowledge, four other sounds that

* The unnecessary dots in i and j are not discarded though.

have to be represented by modifications of it, viz., the sound of the English th in *then*, which is the same as that of the Arabic letter called *zāl* in India and Persia; the sound of the English d (not dental but alveolar); the sound of the Devanagari ड (cerebral or front-palatal), so somewhat different from that of the English d; the sound of the Devanagari ड़, which approaches the sound of the English r in *bird* and is transliterated as ṛ or ṟ by Orientalists, though its sound is nearer to that of their ḍ (=ड) than of their r (=र). By an extension of the dot-ended curve method, d with a figure like a comma attached to it, d with a figure like a reversed comma attached to it, d with a figure like the Bengali letter ঙ attached to it, and d with a figure like the Bengali ঙ reversed attached to it, may respectively represent the four sounds mentioned above. Four appendages cannot fully meet all requirements, it may be urged. Requirements beyond the number four can be but few, and they can be met by inserting under the letter concerned, the initial letter of the name of the language to which any peculiar sound may belong.

"There are eleven Latin vowels: ă ā ĕ ē ŏ ō ĭ ī; y; ŭ ū ....y a sound unknown in common Latin and imported into the learned language from Greece; it answers to French u or to German ü in *Müller*, with, however, a tendency to pass into i."* Letting alone the imported y with its dubious sound, the five Latin

* Brachet's *Etymological Dictionary of the French Language*, Clarendon Press Series, 2nd Edition, Introduction, p. xlviii.

vowels, each with its long and its short sounds, have not the same powers in all the languages that are written with Roman letters. In the English language, for instance, the letter a has, in addition to the proper long and short Latin sounds, as in the words *father* and *mica*, respectively, so many as five other distinct sounds, as in *any, hate, hat, what* and *all*. In French the simple Latin u-sound is represented by ou, while u is used for expressing a peculiar French vowel sound. In English, German and French s has sometimes the s and sometimes the z-sound ; and in German w has always the v-sound, and v the f-sound. Such divergences can have no place in a system of phonetic writing. Such writing justly demands that the Latin sound of every Roman letter should be recognized as its normal sound and that every variation from this normal sound should be represented by the Roman letter marked somehow.

No country in the world is yet prepared to give up its established system of writing and adopt a purely phonetic system in its place. The International Phonetic Association of Paris very properly, therefore, does not aim at dethroning conventional French or English spelling and seating in its place its own phonetic system. It means its system to be a common instrument for phonetically representing the sounds of all languages for a special end, viz., the proper comprehension of the sound by learners, native or foreign. But it does not, like Orientalists, deal only with

non-European languages written in oriental character or hitherto not written at all. It deals with the world's foremost languages,—English, French and German—which are written in Roman character (the German Black Letter Alphabet being substantially the same as the Roman, and now on the way to yield place to it). It is quite legitimate, therefore, to desire that its system should be as faultless as possible, and as well fitted for the daily purposes of life in writing and printing as to iduuce English-speakers, French-speakers, German-speakers, Spanish-speakers, Portuguese-speakers, and speakers of minor languages written in the Roman character, to give up their particular conventional systems and adopt the phonetic system instead. The International Phonetic Script has, however, numerous faults, and I state below in detail what appear to me to be faults in the "phonetic signs" for "the sounds occurring normally in standard English" given by Mr. Rippmann on pp. 24-25 of his *Sounds of Spoken English*, New Version, 1914.

1. The first fault is that consonants are given together first and vowels afterwards. Vowels, as capable of being sounded by themselves, should certainly come before consonants, which cannot be sounded without the help of vowel sounds. Indian grammarians of a very remote past classed together vowels first in scientific order and consonants afterwards in like scientific order. In Mr. Rippmann's lists of consonants and vowels there is not the good comprehensive

scientific order found in the Devanagari alphabet, which drew forth high encomium from the great philologist, Lepsius.

2. The English d and t have not the same sounds as the Continental d and t, of which the Italian sounds, corresponding to those of the Devanagari द and त, respectively, may be taken as the typical representatives. The English d and t are not dental, as the Italian d and t are, nor are they cerebral or front-palatal like the Devanagari ड and ट. They are alveolar, and so intermediate in sound between the dental and the cerebral. European scholars generally make no distinction between the English d and the Continental d, and between the English t and the Continental t. But an alphabet which claims to be phonetic and international is bound to make a discrimination in this matter. Even in English as spoken by Scotsmen, d and t are given their Italian sounds. The Scotsman's English does not indeed come under the head of "Standard English;" but one who wants to study English phonetics scientifically is bound to recognise the Scottish sounds of d and t.

The order in which the letters b and p, d and t, g and k, v and f, etc., are given by Mr. Rippmann, the letters for the voiced sounds preceding the letters for the unvoiced sounds, calls for remark. The order is the reverse of that followed in the Devanagari alphabet. Which is the better order? The Devanagari order seems to be the better of the two.

3. The symbol for the ng-sound in *sing* is far from being objectionable. Indeed it is commendable; it is a deft modification of the practice of dotting. The symbol has been adopted also by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

4. The w in *when* is represented by w, turned upside down, with the remark that "it is doubtful whether this can be called a sound of Standard English." What this supposed sound may be I am unable to guess. As I have heard the word pronounced by Englishmen, it has always sounded to my ears as *hwen*, and I am glad that wh "is symbolised by hw in the system of re-spelling in the Oxford English Dictionary."*

5. If v be recognised as the Latin equivalent of the Devanagari व् and the English w, the English v, which is equivalent to व् *plus* ह् or w *plus* h, should be represented by vh.

6. Instead of the awkward Anglo-Saxon character, which is quite inimical to facile writing, d simply marked somehow, would be a better representative of the th-sound in *clothe*.

7. Instead of the Greek letter *theta* for the sound of th in *cloth*, t somehow marked *plus* h would serve better, and this not only for convenience of writing, but also for the reason that this English th-sound is not a simple sound but a compound of a modified t or त्-sound and an h-sound. It may also well be

---

* Guide to Pronunciation in *New International Webster's Dictionary*, 1912, p. lvii.

emphasised that the Greek letter *theta* cannot well fit into English writing.

8. The symbol given for the sound of s in *leisure* is not a newly invented symbol, but it is a big symbol. Z marked somehow would be a handier and so a better symbol.

9. The symbol given for the English sh-sound is, as has already been remarked, very objectionable, as being quite unlike in shape to the letter s, which usually expresses a kindred sound but expresses also the same sound in *sugar*.

10. The analysis of the English ch-sound into tsh and of the English j-sound into dzh is accepted by Mr. Rippmann. The analysis has the support of such high authorities as Sir James Murray and Prof. Whitney, and has evidently its origin in the French tch and dj. "Even though we accept the analysis (which some persons are not inclined to do)," says Mr. J. C. Nesfield, M. A., "it would be very inconvenient to write tsh for ch and dzh for j. Moreover, the sounds in question are of such frequent occurrence in our language, that j and ch, even if they are diphthongal, deserve a place in our list of consonantal symbols."*

"The compound consonants ch and j, in *church* and *judge*, have also strictly a right," says Prof. Whitney, "to separate representation; since, though their final element respectively is [s and z with an

* *Idiom, Grammar and Synthesis,* 1914, p. 434.

angular mark over each in the original, for sh and zh], their initial element is not precisely our usual t and d, but one of another quality, more palatal."*

If men of such high eminence as Prof. Whitney and Sir James Murray have held ch and j to be compound consonants, "some persons," we are told by Mr. Nesfield, who is not one of them, "are not inclined" to accept this view. Among Mr. Nesfield's "some persons" must be included, I think, great English Philologists from Sir William Jones down to Sir George Grierson, who have identified ch with च with its modern sound and the corresponding Bengali and Persian letters, and j with ज with its modern sound and the corresponding Bengali and Persian letters. Nay, all English-men in India who have been concerned with the spelling of such proper names as Cheyt Singh, Chunar, Chittagong, Jai Singh, Jodhpur and Punjab must come under the same category as the great philologists. I know also that a very clear-headed Englishman of high distinction, now spending the evening of his life in his native land after conspicuously meritorious service in India, holds the view that the ch and j sounds in English are simple sounds corresponding respectively to particular Bengali and Hindustani simple sounds. I do not mention his name here, because I have not sought and obtained his permission to do so. It seems clear that all cultured men who speak English as their vernacular do not pronounce the English ch and j

* *Language and Its Study*, 1880, p. 92.

sounds in the same way. Some pronounce them as simple sounds, and others as compound sounds, the elements of which cannot clearly be given, for the English t *plus* sh cannot in any way give the English ch-sound, and the English d *plus* zh (= z in *azure*) cannot in any way give the English j-sound. Nor is it at all clear to me that the Italian t-sound or the English t-sound in *thin*, compounded with the English sh-sound, could give the English ch-sound ; or that the Italian d-sound or the English th-sound in *then*, compounded with the sound of z in *azure*, could give the English j-sound. It is for the English-speaking world to settle how the English ch and j-sounds are to be properly graphically represented. Perhaps c for ch, and j marked somehow (to distinguish it from the German j) for j might answer. C is already used by Orientalists for च्.

A foot-note on p. 5 of Mr. Rippmann's book contains a pregnant remark. "It might be thought that reference to a dictionary would be sufficient to settle disputed points. However, it may be said that no dictionary—not even the familiar Webster or the great Oxford English Dictionary, now in course of publication—can be implicitly trusted in matters of pronunciation. On the whole our dictionaries strive to record educated southern English speech, with some concessions to Northern English." A standardisation of the pronunciation of English for all English-speaking lands appears to be desirable.

11. J is given its German sound, the sound being said to be the same as that of y in *yes*. But can y be rightly recognised as a consonant in English, and does it not deserve to be rejected as a vowel, on the ground of its being superfluous?

12. Representation of the English r-sound by the same symbol as the continental r-sound and the Devanagari र-sound is bad. There should be a differentiating mark for the English r-sound.

13. A word here about the f-sound. Is it not a compound of a modified p-sound and an h-sound? This modified p-sound does not indeed exist independently in English, and other languages that have the f-sound. But this cannot make f a simple sound.

Though not connected particularly with Mr. Rippmann, a remark I have to make here about the practice in Europe of making ts stand for a simple sound. It is held to be equivalent to the German z, and so to the East Bengal চ and to च with its ancient sound. The sound of ts in *Tsar* is a simple and not a compound sound. So it should be represented by a single letter and not a combination of two letters. There is a close relation between this ts-sound and the sound which c has partially in Italian, as in the name Medici. C with this sound has been appropriated by Orientalists for the representation of च with its modern sound. If c stands for this sound, ç would be a very appropriate substitute for ts.

Coming now to Mr. Rippmann's list of vowels, the first remark I have to make is that in giving pairs of vowels as consisting of a long and a short one each, Mr. Rippmann follows a method which is the reverse of that followed by Indian grammarians. The question is a physiological one Did the long vowels originate first, or the short ones? The short ones appear to have originated before the long ones, as is evidenced by the fact of the earliest alphabets being without vowel symbols The Indian grammarians appear, therefore, to have followed the right track.

I come now to details —

1. It is not at all clear to me that the first vowel sound in *fairy* is organically different from that of e in *bet* and not a lengthening of it, so as to make it necessary to represent it by a new letter.

2. The impropriety of the symbol æ for the vowel sound in *bat* has already been shown.

3. It is not at all clear to me that the first vowel sound in *bite* is not simply the short of a in *father*, as is the first vowel sound in *house*, sounded haus (German *haus*), but an organically different sound that requires to be represented by a letter different in shape from a in *father*. I see no reason, again, why the historical hooded a should not be used in *father*, but be used for the first vowel sound in *bite* while the a in *father* should be represented by a new unhooded a. The unhooded a may well be used for the vowel sound in *pot* and *law*.

4. The vowel, long in *law* and short in *pot*, is represented by a new character quite different in shape from o, which in English and also in German has in some cases the sound of o in *pot*. Besides the objectionable shape of the letter, there is the further objection against it that it is very ill adapted for writing.

5. The inverted e adopted for representing the second vowel sound in *better* and the supposed long of this vowel sound in *burn* calls for a good deal of comment. Mr. Nesfield, in his *Idiom, Grammar and Synthesis*, 1914, p. 431, calls the inverted e an "awkward-looking symbol" and this awkward-looking symbol and its doubling for indicating its long sound (the doubling not adopted by the International Phonetic Association) have the support of great names—Skeat, Sweet and Murray. But great men do sometimes fail to grasp all aspects of a question. The invention of the inverted e symbol has its origin in the English convention of expressing the sound of the symbol by e. The sound of e in the words *gather* and *confer* (Mr. Nesfield's examples) has no affinity to the Latin sound of e, but has affinity to the short sound of the Latin a and the English sound of u in *hut* or *but*. Instead of an e inverted, a marked somehow would be a better means of representing the second vowel sound in *better*.

6. As for the new symbol for "the vowel sound" (evidently meant for the first vowel sound) in *butter*, I am unable to understand in what the sound of u in

butter differs from that of u in *bun* and *burn*. Here one is reminded of what Max Müller says about Sir John Herschel's hearing "but the same sound in *spurt, assert, bird, dove, oven, double, blood,*" and Sheridan and Smart's distinguishing "between the vowels in *bird* and *work*, in *whirl'd* and *world*."* It is not for a foreigner to venture to say anything about a question like this in which native Englishmen differ among themselves. But the recognition of e in *clerk* as having an ā-sound, the transformation of *university* into *varsity* and the vulgar or provincial pronunciation of *sir* being written *sah* and of *sisters* being written *sistahs*,† indicate even to the foreigner that the e in *her* and the i in *sir* have the short sound of the Latin a modified a bit. Mr. Nesfield gives e in *confer* as the long of e in *gather*. Now the *fer* in *confer* is certainly not the same in sound as *far*. The e in *gather* and *confer* can thus be held to have a modified sound of the Latin ă and ā, respectively.

The International Phonetic Association's method of nasalising vowels is the same as that of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. The method is exceedingly good.

The International Phonetic Script keeps up a difference of form between printed and script characters. This is another serious objection against it.

---

* Max Müller's *Lectures on the Science of Language*, 2nd Series 1864, p. 112.

† Under the head of "Varieties" in the Calcutta *Statesman* of July 27, 1902.

Who can say that one system of weights and measures, one system of coinage, and one common alphabet would not benefit the world? The world would take time indeed to attain these benefits. The dreams of to-day become the realities of to-morrow. Hope lies in this.

9. ESPERANTO *VERSUS* ENGLISH INTERNATIONALIZED.

From the Modern Review for November 1919.

Many languages are spoken in the world, some over large areas and some over small ones. There is facility of intercourse between people speaking the same language, and difficulty of intercourse between people speaking different languages. This difficulty can be overcome only if individuals learn one or more languages other than their own. The difficulty could be greatly reduced if some one language were recognized as the common medium of intercourse for speakers of all languages. Latin came thus to be used among the learned in Europe as the common language for communication and for the writing of works of international importance. Bacon wrote his *Novum Organum*, and Newton his *Principia*, in Latin. Milton was Latin Secretary to Cromwell ; but for diplomatic intercourse French came to be ultimately adopted as the common medium in Europe, a position which it still retains, though in a diminished measure. Eminent foreigners—Leibnitz, Frederick the Great, and Humboldt—Germans all of them—also wrote in French. The French people no longer possess the political and intellectual ascendancy they once had in Europe, and this, together with their present numerical inferiority

to the English-speaking and German-speaking peoples, has been bringing about a diminishing use of French even in diplomacy, which has been its special province so long. At the Congress of Berlin in 1878 Prince Bismarck spoke in English, and at the Peace Conference lately held at Versailles French and English were both used. Representations from Germany were received in German, and translations here were of help.

The English-speaking area is now the most extensive language-area in the world ; and not only the comparatively small German-speaking and French-speaking areas taken together fall far short of it, but the very extensive language-areas —Russian, Spanish, Portuguese and Chinese —are also each a long way behind the English. English is now decidedly the dominant language of the world . The area of the British Empire, as given in *The Statesman's Year-Book* for 1913, p. LXXVI, is 10,814,433 square miles. To this area has to be added an area of some 800,000 square miles, which, as Mr. Lloyd George said the other day in the House of Commons, has come over to Britain and British Dominions under the mandatory system, the total area of the British Empire coming up thus to 11,600,000 square miles in round numbers. The area of the United States, as in *The Statesman's Year-Book*, 1913, p. 383, is 3,571,223 square miles. The entire dominion of the English race comes up thus, in round numbers, to 15,200,000 square miles, out

of the entire land surface of the world, which in Whitaker's *Almanack* for 1919, p. 99, is given as 55,500,000 square miles, including the almost uninhabitable polar regions, which are put at the enormous figure of 5,000,000 square miles. Over the whole of the English area, English is not and cannot be the vernacular tongue. In Asia and in Africa very large areas, and in America a considerable area, viz., the Canadian French-speaking province of Quebec, can never in all human probability be English-speaking lands. But over the whole dominion of the English race English must have a dominant position; where it is not the mother language it must be the "second language." The late eminent statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, born French-Canadian, was as much at home in English as in his mother-tongue, French. General Smuts, Dutch Afrikander as he is, has shown himself a capital master of English. In India there have been many Indians whose mastery of English has been complete. But in addition to these, thousands of undergraduates and graduates are thrown out every year by our schools and colleges, whose knowledge of English is of various grades. English is now the dominant foreign language in the important independent countries of China and Japan. In China it has even given rise to a jargon called Pigeon or Pidgin English, which really means business English and is used between Chinese and Europeans. In Lady Brassey's *Voyage in the 'Sunbeam'* (1908, p. 294),

is given "Take piecey missisy one piecey bag topside" as Pidgin English for "Take the lady's bag upstairs." From this it appears that Pidgin English is not a very simple affair.

In science for sometime past German has held the first place, French the second, and English the third. But politically and commercially, English has had an overwhelming superiority over both French and German. It has also an inherent superiority over both French and German. Its grammar is simpler than that of French and much simpler than that of German. Why then does not English come to be spontaneously adopted as the common medium of international intercourse? Why, with such a language ready to hand, have attempts been made to invent an artificial language for purposes of international communication? Volapuk (world-speech) was the artificial language put before the world as a world-language about the year 1879 by its German originator, Schleyer. It had not much success. About eight years later a far cleverer artificial international language, now widely known as Esperanto, was put before the world by the late Lithuanian savant, Dr. Zamenhof. A later international language, called Ido, has come into the field. I know only of its being mentioned as an improvement upon Esperanto.

In constructing his vocabulary Dr. Zamenhof had particularly his eye on words which are similar in the principal European languages as, for instance,

chamber, *fish* and *nose*, which in Esperanto appear as *cambro*, *fisho*,* and *naso*. The Esperanto vocabulary has been constructed with wonderful ingenuity. It is based mainly on Latin stems, but not exclusivley ; for instance, *fisho** with the final o removed, is the same as the English *fish* and the German *fisch*, but is a little different from the Latin *piscis*. As regards his grammar Dr. Zamenhof told the late Mr. W. T. Stead† that he drew his first inspiration from the simple grammatical structure of the English language, and that it was from Russian that he got the idea that by means of suffixes he "might make an endless number of words out of one root". All nouns in Esperanto end in *o*, all adjectives in *a*, and all adverbs in *e*. Males and females are distinguished by the insertion of *in* before the *o* of the noun ; as patro (father), patrino (mother). English grammar is simple enough, but it is less simple than that of Esperanto, which is however less simple in certain respects than that of the Asiatic languages, Persian, Hindustani, and Bengali, which Dr. Zamenhof apparently had no knowledge of. These three languages have no distinction of *he*, *she* and *it*, as Esperanto, like English, has. Nor has Bengali, like English and Esperanto, a distinction of number in verbs. Esperanto is thus not as simple in its grammatical structure as it is possible for a language to be. Nevertheless, in its grammatical structure as well as in its vocables, it has a clear advantage over English. It has already acquired a large currency, and this currency is on the

* Here sh is used for the Esperanto symbol for the English sh-ound, s with an angular mark over it.

† *The Review of Reviews*, September 1905, p. 257.

increase. If English is to be set up as a world-language in competition with Esperanto, it requires to be divested of certain drawbacks that now attend it. This divestment should be restricted to English as it may be fitted out for use as an international language and not be sought to be at once imposed on English as spoken and written in all English-speaking lands. The simplifications made for internationalizing English may be left to work their way, from their own merit, into current English everywhere.

Standardization of pronunciation and phonetic spelling are essential requisites of internationalized English, and these may, with advantage, be at once applied to the current English of the present day. Sir Harry Johnston in England and Prof. Brander Mathew in America are strong advocates of standardization of English pronunciation, a difficult process indeed and in need of revision after long intervals to suit changed pronunciations. But it is a necessary preliminary to phonetic writing. Phonetic writing hardly needs any justification, non-phonetic writing being simply irrational though, being of long standing, it has necessarily a host of supporters. Sir Harry Johnston is a powerful champion of phonetic spelling being applied to English, French, and other transgressors of phoneticism. The British and American public have now to some extent come to see their English language spelt phonetically in the International Phonetic Script. This has been a good step towards

disposing English-speaking peoples to give up their bad conventional method of spelling for a phonetic one. The International Phonetic Script is admittedly imperfect, and needs improvement, which indeed it seeks. I criticised this script in the last May number of *the Modern Review*, and showed that some of its letters were bad. It has discarded capital letters, but retains the Roman blemish of script letters different in shape from printed letters. This blemish requires to be swept away.

In connection with application of phonetic spelling to English, it has to be noted that, though the general rule should be that the spelling should conform to the standard sound, it would be very desirable that in the two special cases mentioned below, a reverse process should be adopted.

(1) Proper names, like *Dante* and *Beatrice*, from Italian, and other proper names from any other phonetically written language should retain their present spelling in English, but their sounds should conform, as far as is possible, to their native sounds. While *Dante* and *Beatrice*, for instance, retain their present spelling in English, it would be best to pronounce them in the Italian way, barring of course the Italian sounds of the letters d and t, which English-speakers' organs of speech fail to pronounce.

(2) Learned words like *centigrade* and *oxygen*, drawn from Latin and Greek and spelt alike or very nearly alike in English and in the Latin family

of languages, should retain their present English spelling and be pronounced, as far as possible, in accordance with the Latin and Greek sounds of letters, so that this class of words may have a uniformity of sounds all over the English and Latin worlds.

Slang terms are rightly considered inadmissible in serious writing, and so their use in English internationalized must be interdicted. Some slang terms have in the past acquired, by reason of their particular fitness, a recognised place in the language, and this process may go on in the future. All slang terms that win their way to recognition can properly be introduced into internationalized English.

With slang terms should also be banned all English idiomatic expressions of an arbitrary character. "As good a man as ever trod shoe-leather"* for "as good a man as ever lived" is quite an arbitrary English idiom, for no rational interpretation of the terms that make up the phrase can yield even in a figurative way the meaning intended to be conveyed. "Treading shoe-leather" may be interpreted as meaning "wearing shoes," but the wearing of shoes cannot be taken to constitute the essence of living or even a main function of it. No objection can be taken, be it understood, to figurative expressions like "was born with a silver spoon in his mouth," which involve no logical flaw. Banishment from English internationally employed

* Readers of Shakespear's *Julius Cæsar* have to put up with "As proper men as ever trod upon neat's leather."

of expressions involving a logical flaw may reasonably be demanded. Their banishment from every kind of English would be a gain to the language.

In connection with the question of logical flaw may be considered the English puzzle of the use of *shall* and *will*. *Shall* and *will* are the two auxiliary verbs by means of which the future tense is formed in English, and about them Mr. Nesfield writes as follows* :—"One of the puzzles in English is to know when to use "shall" and when to use "will". With a view to clearing up this matter it should be understood that there are three senses in which the future tense can be used :—

(a) To express *merely future time* and nothing more.

(b) To combine future time with an implied *command*.

(c) To combine future time with an implied *intention*."

But what admits of no clearing up is why *shall* and *will* should bear different senses in different persons and also bear in assertive sentences senses different from what they bear in interrogative ones. The present conventional uses of *shall* and *will* can claim no basis in reason, and it is exceedingly difficult to understand how they originated. Cutting the Gordian knot was found to be the best way of dealing with it. May not the present knot be cut too? It may be cut

* *Idiom, Grammar and Synthesis* by J. C. Nesfield, M. A., 1914, p. 63.

by laying down the rule that 'shall' *shall* in all cases indicate what happens in the natural course of things (moral obligation being included in this, as in "Thou shalt not steal"), and that 'will' in all cases *shall* indicate intention. The solution of the puzzle offered here is indeed a very bold one, particularly bold as coming from a foreigner. But the solution offered, if accepted, would be a boon to all foreigners learning English, and a boon also to future generations of native English-speaking people.

Languages have changed in the past, and the changes undergone have almost wholly been in the direction of increased simplicity. The printing press has now set up a barrier against changes and so given a certain fixity to languages. But as a stage of perfection has been reached yet by no language, it is desirable that a comparative study of languages should be made the means of deliberately effecting changes that would be improvements. An encumbrance that has disappeared from a closely related language or some dialect of the language itself which is wanted to be improved, is fit to be dropped from the language. Grammatical gender has to be admitted to be an encumbrance in a language. It does not exist in English, but exists in German (in three genders, masculine, feminine and neuter) and in French (in two genders, masculine and feminine). It does not exist in Bengali (borrowings from Sanskrit like *hitakari sabha* being excluded), but exists in two genders.

(masculine and feminine) in literary Hindustani (in both its Urdu and Hindi phases). Hindustani (in its Urdu phase) as spoken in Bihar is however partially free from it. Many words that are feminine nouns in standard Hindustani, are ordinarily used as masculines in Bihar. Can it then be said that it is impossible to cast off grammatical gender altogether from Hindustani? If the idea spreads that grammatical gender is an unnecessary burden upon a language, that some speakers of Hindustani actually disregard it, and that what, according to the orthodox view, are grammatical mistakes and corruptions, are really in many cases but improvements in a language, then a disposition may grow up for the discarding of grammatical gender from Hindustani altogether. There are difficulties in the way, but they cannot be pronounced insurmountable. Great writers may be pioneers of the change.

The difficulty arising from the existence in English of what are called synonyms is one very hard to deal with. Words have come into the English language from two main sources, Teutonic and Latin, and this has caused in some cases a word of Teutonic origin and another of Latin origin meaning the same thing in English, as, *forgive* and *pardon*, and *freedom* and *liberty*. The synonymous words have come to be applied somewhat differently, however, in the language "Beg your pardon" is good English, but "beg your forgiveness" is not, though "beg to be forgiven"

cannot be objected to. So "set free" is reckoned good English, but "set at freedom" is not, though "set at liberty" is. In these cases a reasonable solution of the difficulty would be to put *forgive* and *pardon*, and *freedom* and *liberty* on exactly the same footing in regard to their use. But there are numerous cases, where derivation from different sources is not a factor and where slight shades of difference of meaning have arisen from usage. About this class of words, the suggestion I have to offer is that a number of British and American experts, well-versed in philology and in the methods of science, should undertake to investigate the shades of difference of meaning between English synonyms in a rational and not a conventional spirit, and then lay the results of their labours before the world as a help alike to native and foreign students of English.

In spite of all the disadvantages of the English vocabulary as compared with that of Esperanto, it can emphatically be asserted in favour of the former that it has all the life and vigour which thinking and feeling in it by a vigorous race of men for generations have imparted to it. Do people think and feel in Esperanto, or do they translate into Esperanto what they think and feel in their respective mother tongues? Can Esperanto or any other artificial language have such simple, vivid and happy combinations of words as are found in the following lines from English poetry?

1. Brevity is the soul of wit.

2. He jests at scars that never felt a wound.
3. Where more is meant than meets the ear.
4. To party gave up what was meant for mankind
5. 'T is the sunset of life gives me mystical lore
   And coming events cast their shadows before.
6. Eternal summer gilds them yet,
   But all except their sun is set.
7. Our sweetest songs are those
   That tell of saddest thought.
8. 'T is only noble to be good.

Science is the common property of all the world, and it is most desirable that language barriers should part its votaries as little as possible. It would obviously be an advantage to scientific investigators all over the world if contributions to science in all its branches came before the world in some particular language and were thus easily accessible to all investigators. Patriotic impulse is here an opposing force. But there is a way in which a reconciliation may here be effected between patriotism and cosmopolitanism. There can be no obstacle in the way of the speaker of any language, however limited may be the area over which it is spoken, recording and publishing his researches in his own language for home consumption and publishing at the same time for world consumption a translation of the original record into English or French or German at present, and in future into a universally recognized international language, if there is to be one such. I would here instance the fact of

The Mediterranean Race of Prof. Sergi, which contains a very valuable contribution to the science of anthropology, being published first in the Professor's native language, Italian, and a little later in German and in English; * and also in the announcements, facing the title-page of Prof. Seligman's *Principles of Economics*, of translations of the author's works into French, Italian, Spanish, Russian and Japanese. A scientific work is not like a poetical composition which must be without much of its native flavour, if brought out as a translation. It can lose nothing by translation.

A discussion here of the contention of the patriotic school which stands up for scientific contributions being made in the contributor's vernacular tongue seems to be very necessary. Prof. Mendeleeff, the great Russian chemist, recorded his researches in his native Russian, and not in French or German. This gained him admirers at home and abroad. Among his foreign admirers is our widely renowned countryman, Sir Asutosh Mookerjee, whose great all-round ability, untiring energy, and culture, wide and deep, have made him a veritable power in the land. I append here an English translation of the extract given in the

* "When this little book was first published in an Italian edition in 1895, and in a German edition in 1897, I was still unable to obtain many anthropological data needed to complete the picture of the primitive inhabitants of Europe. In the English edition the book is less incomplete, richer in anthropological documents, and hence more conclusive; ...." Preface to the English edition, 1901.

Bengali periodical *Prabasi* for Magh 1323, B. S., p. 1, of the address read by Sir Asutosh at the tenth meeting of the Bengali Sahitya-Sammilani held at Bankipur about two years and a half ago :—

ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF EXTRACT.

If Bengal's glories, Dr. Rabindranath Tagore, Professors Jagadish Chandra [and] Praphulla Chandra and other present intellectuals of Bengal embody the treasures of the weight of their knowledge in Bengali, and if those in whose hands will be placed in future the domain of knowledge go on recording in Bengali the final results of their knowledge, and if in this way for a long time the service done to Bengali literature continue uninterruptedly, then a day will assuredly come when many among cultured foreigners must have eagerly to learn Bengali. If in Bengal those, who attain eminence in any subject,—become specialists in any subject,—instead of making their discoveries,—their waves of thought—take shape in a foreign tongue, add to the greatness of their mother-land and so of their mother-tongue, Bengali, by displaying them in their own mother-tongue, then other educated communities of the world will be obliged to study the Bengali language.

The editor of the *Prabasi* notes that in the address the example of Russia has been given and says that the Russian chemist Mendeleeff did indeed record his researches in Russian, but it is necessary to remember

the difference between the condition of Russia and that of Bengal.

Patriotism obscures the mental vision not only of men of the ordinary stamp, but of men also of superior mental powers. In the present instance Sir Asutosh Mookerjee's superior intellect has not been able to screen him from the injurious influence of patriotic feeling. The prescription he lays down for cultivators of science in Bengal to follow to compel foreign cultivators of science to learn Bengali, widely interpreted, amounts to the imposition of a most intolerable burden on future cultivators of science all over the world. Bengali is not the only cultivated language in India, and Bengalis are not the only intellectual people in India. Leaving aside the cultivated Indian languages of the Dravidian family, Bengali, Hindi, Urdu, Marathi and Gujrati are the Indo-Aryan languages that have a progressive literature each. Are foreign students of science in future to be under the necessity of learning all these languages ? If so, they should also be under the necessity of learning the great Asiatic languages, Persian, Arabic, Chinese and Japanese, the people speaking them being of a high order of mentality and so capable of advancing knowledge in future. At present students of science who want to keep themselves abreast of the progress of science have to possess a knowledge, varying in degree, of the three great European languages, German, French and English, which are the chief media now for scientific contributions.

Next after these comes Italian, and next after Italian, Russian. Leaving aside the minor languages of Europe, there remain Spanish and Portuguese, each spread over a vast area, which, though not now very active contributors to advancing knowledge, hold in them promise enough of a better career in future—a promise warranted by the past intellectual history of the Spanish and Portuguese races, and also by the large recruitments of Italian immigrants that these two races have been receiving in South America. According to Sir Asutosh Mookerjee's prescription, taken in its widest range, all the above host of languages must have to be learnt by cultivators of science in future—a very dismal prospect indeed. But there is comfort in the thought that such a thing can never be, to hamper the advancement of science. As regards the value of translations from foreign languages into one's own, the passage quoted below from Emerson will bear ample testimony:

"I rarely read any Latin, Greek, German, Italian, sometimes not a French book in the original, which I can procure in a good version. I like to be beholden to the great metropolitan English speech, the sea which receives tributaries from every region."*

As a matter of fact, it was not the chemical researches of Prof. Mendeleeff, recorded in Russian, which induced *many* persons in Western Europe and America to learn Russian, but the attractive literary works

* *Selected Essays*, Nelson's 6d. Classics, p. 342.

of Tolstoy, Turgenief and others. Bankimchandra's and Rabindranath's attractive literary works have won the regard of many Europeans for our noble mother-tongue, Bengali. It is best for us to employ it, ridding it of the baneful effects of Pandit influence that still continue to afflict it, in the cultivation of every branch of human knowledge, without any thought about foreigners learning it or not. Nor should we think of confining the splendid scientific discoveries of Sir Jagadish Chandra Bose and Sir Praphulla Chandra Ray within the limited ring-fence of the Bengali language, but should be broad-minded enough to consider it a fortunate circumstance that the discoverers have English at their command to make known their discoveries to all civilised lands.

I have spoken of patriotic feelings as producing a narrowing effect on the mind. There is reason to fear that patriotic feeling, particularly in France and Germany, whose languages are the rivals of English in the world of knowledge, might stand up against internationalized English being adopted as the international language of the world. An artificial language like Esperanto or Ido can evoke no hostile feeling. There is good reason, however, to hope that broad considerations of practical convenience and an increasing sense of human solidarity will induce Frenchmen, Germans, Italians and men of other nationalities to accept internationalized English as the most convenient means of international communication, just as they were induced to accept French as the common language of all diplomatic intercourse.

10. REFORM OF FIGHTING IN COURTS OF LAW.

From the Modern Review for September 1921.

Fighting in Courts of Law between individuals or between the State and one or more individuals is a civil contest carried on with weapons of law, and not with weapons of violence. The combatants here are highly trained men of keen intellects, a very large part of the highest talent in every civilized country being drawn to this body of combatants. But the combatants are mercenaries after all, for they sell their services indiscriminately for pay. This gives the litigant with the long purse an immense advantage over the litigant with the small purse. The higher the fee paid the abler is the advocacy secured. Generally speaking, a man of small means has hardly any chance of success in a legal contest with a man of large means. "The law's delay" has become a proverbial expression, and delay means additional expenditure. With the system of the distribution of justice now prevailing in civilized countries great dissatisfaction has been widely felt. In France, in 1793, popular courts were introduced in place of the then existing courts, but they did not answer. Soviet Russia has followed the course taken by France in 1793 and has abolished the Bar. But this too will not answer. In our own country Mahatma Gandhi sometime back declared himself against law courts and legal

practitioners. This propaganda of his has had but trifling success, and is bound to fail completely.

The reform of the existing system of judicial administration should follow the line of retaining all that is good in the existing system and of casting off all that is evil. For the performance of judicial work, civil or criminal, specialization is necessary, if it is necessary in any department of human life. The present practice of specialization for judicial officers and advocates requires to be retained, and judicial officers require to be highly paid, and also advocates, if they are to be made servants of the State, as is proposed in this paper. How advocates as servants of the State are to work, will be indicated later on. Soviet Russia has made all medical practitioners servants of the State and employed them to look after the health of the entire body of the people. A similar idea has been making its way in some other countries. States are bound to grow more and more sociocratic* and look after the welfare of all classes of people from top to bottom. Germany was leading the way in this matter, but the war, for which, by the way, she is responsible, has crippled her, as it has crippled her great neighbours, Britain and France. But progress all round must come, as recovery is made from effects of the war, and the State must care more and more for all classes of people.

* After a certain writer I use the word "sociocratic" to express a sense somewhat different from that of the word "socialistic."

As servants of the State, advocates may work in this wise. When a suit comes up before a Court, the Court may refer the parties to the suit to about an equal number of about equally competent advocates; and these advocates, after studying all aspects of the suit for each contending party, may put before the Court the results of their study, and point out favourable and unfavourable points alike. There can thus be an all-round elucidation of the case, and with the help thus rendered the Court can pronounce a sound judgment. Judgments thus arrived at must be much nearer perfection than judgments under the existing system, and so discourage litigation. It is because the results of litigation, under the present system, are more or less uncertain that men are apt to rush to law. Under the system proposed, litigants are not to incur any costs. But as wrong-doers require, in justice, to be punished, parties to a suit may be made to deposit in the Court certain amounts proportioned to the values of the suits, before the suits are proceeded with. After the results of appeals are finally pronounced, the deposits of parties losing suits should be forfeited. This should be the case with civil suits In criminal suits, suitable punishments, according to law, for the accused who are convicted, is the proper course. Some provision seems necessary for awarding compensation to accused persons who are acquitted

The system of judicial machinery advocated in this paper would necessarily add largely to the expenditure

of the State. But this increased expenditure may be met by reducing expenditure on armaments as largely as possible. If, under the regime of the League of Nations or a modification thereof, war is to be made impossible, or very nearly impossible, there would be great room for the reduction of expenditure on armaments.

The existing system of advocacy in Courts has given rise to a code of ethics among advocates, which is by no means defensible. According to this code, it is the business of the Court to *judge*. The advocate is not bound to *judge*. He is free to take up any case that is "arguable". A good advocate cannot fail to distinguish between a good case and a bad case. But how many are the good advocates who refuse every case they believe to be bad? No case, however bad, fails to get an advocate, and, generally speaking, the worse the case the heavier is the fee demanded and paid. If all advocates *judged* and all refused cases which they *judged* to be bad, bad cases would have no advocacy, and the world would be the better for this. Able advocacy of a bad case often defeats the ends of justice. Here I may pertinently quote words that fell from the lips of the Advocate-General of the Calcutta High Court, Mr. S. P. Sinha (now Lord Sinha), when the Vakils' Association gave an address to the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Saradacharan Mitra on the eve of his retirement from the High Court Bench in December 1908.* "I desire", said the Advocate-General, "on behalf of the members

* *The Statesman*, December 18, 1908.

of the Bar to associate myself with every word that has fallen from my friend, Babu Ram Charan Mitter. I think I voice the feelings of all members of the profession when I say we all felt that when we appeared before your lordship with a good case we were certain to win, and equally, if we appeared with a bad case we were bound to lose. That is the highest praise which members of my profession can give to a judge of this Court." Here is evidence from very high authority that the members of the legal profession do appear before judges with bad cases. If advocates of all grades were made servants of the State and had only to minister to the ends of justice, being entirely freed from the necessity of striving to win clients' cases, the moral atmosphere of our Courts of Law would be purged of a moral taint that has long infected it. In connection with this moral taint a typical generally accepted theory* of members of the legal profession may here well be commented on. The theory is that, if after a lawyer has undertaken to defend an accused person, without of course knowing him to be guilty, the accused person of his own accord, makes a confession of his guilt to the lawyer, the lawyer would still be bound to defend him, for otherwise the accused would be in a perilous situation. Here the position is that the lawyer's duty to his client binds him to defend him, fully knowing him to be guilty, ignoring thus the duty he owes to himself and to society. Why should not the

* Sir Gooroo Dass Banerjee's "জ্ঞান ও কর্ম", p 378.

lawyer in such a case tell his client that his confession made it impossible for him to defend him, that he would find another lawyer for him, and that to that lawyer no such confession should be made as had been made to him? Should there be no time to find another lawyer, the only unimpeachable course for the lawyer engaged would be to say before the Court all that could be said in the client's favour, but to say at the same time that he himself did not believe the client to be guiltless.

I shall conclude now with a few remarks on *trial by jury*, which however necessary and beneficial a system at the stage of human history when judges are subservient to the executive authority of Government, becomes an anachronism and an evil when judges become quite independent. Trial by jury works notoriously badly in the Southern States of the American Union when Whites are opposed to Blacks, and its working in India, when Whites are opposed to Browns is notoriously unsatisfactory. In France, which is one of the foremost countries in the world, it sometimes causes a scandalous miscarriage of justice which I read in *The Weekly Graphic* of January 6, 1894. To save space I quote here only the last sentence of the account. "But because the greater number of the victims of the rioting last August were Italians, the jury felt it incumbent on themselves to demonstrate their patriotism by practically declaring that for a Frenchman to kill an Italian competitor is no crime

at all." Not many years ago Madame Caillaux deliberately shot the Editor of *The Figaro* dead in Paris, and a jury of gallant Frenchmen, tender to her sex and her passional crime, acquitted her. Pope's cutting remark, "And wretches hang that jurymen may dine," carries matters too far But acute observer as Pope was, he did observe that men were unwilling to serve on juries. Why compel unwilling men to do jurymen's work ? There has long been a clamour in India for the extension of the jury system. Perhaps extension has been desired as a means of security for persons accused of any political offence against the supposed leaning of English judicial officers towards Government. The jury system, instead of receiving an extended area of operations, should receive its extinction as early as the independence of those who judge is completely secured.

II. REFORM OF FIGHTING IN COURTS OF LAW (No. 2).

From the Modern Review for May 1923.

The present article is meant to be a brief supplement to my article, "Reform of Fighting in Courts of Law." which appeared in the *The Modern Review* for September, 1921. Copies of the latter article, I sent to five eminent Indians and to five eminent Englishmen, and solicited their opinions about the views the article contained. From one Indian gentleman and one English gentleman I received no expression of opinion, and most of the others expressed no favourable opinion about my scheme of reform. One English gentleman, who accorded support to my attack on the system of trial by jury, called my proposal for turning advocates into servants of the State "an almighty tall order on the merits of which I do not feel in any way competent to judge." A second English gentleman said, "I am disposed to agree with it, especially the remarks on trial by jury." A third English gentleman said, "But though I do not believe that the time for your reforms has arrived or is near, I heartily commend your shaking up conventional ideas." Names of the authors of the opinions I have quoted and of the other persons to whom I addressed myself, I am of course not free to give.

An age-long established order of things comes, as a matter of course, to be regarded as natural. The world's mightiest thinker, Aristotle, believed slavery to be a natural human institution, and so one destined to endure for ever. No wonder then that most of the very able men whose opinions I sought on the subject of my proposed reform held the present position of advocates to be quite conformable to the natural constitution of human society and so ethically just. It is encouraging to me, however, that two at least out of the ten, whose opinions I sought, thought my contention to be valid The system of judicial administration that now prevails in the civilized world is then not one that all sane minds must accept as unassailable. It is certainly not equally conducive to the interests of all members of a community, but does plainly favour the rich at the expense of the poor, and it demoralizes society by drawing most part of the very pick of the youth of a community into a band of mercenaries, every one of whom must hold himself ready to fight in a court of law for anybody who will pay him for the fight.

The State's function is gradually drawing towards an all-round care for the welfare of every individual member of the community. In such a process of *State-Socialism*, Germany was taking the lead before the Great War. The process is bound to advance, and under such advance the administration of justice must come in for reform. It

cannot permanently remain the faulty thing it now is. I advocate the conversion of all members of the Bar into servants of the State and prescribe their function to be to put before the Court all the points of a case—not only those that are favourable but also those that are unfavourable—so that the arrival at a just conclusion by the Court may be helped to the farthest limit. No other line of reform suggests itself to my mind.

An argument advanced by one of the Indian opponents of my scheme of reform I greatly value. The argument is this :—"Furthermore the profession of law is the only lucrative profession open to the people of this country. If the income of lawyers be diminished, as it necessarily must be, if they are employed by the State, the only or at least the main source of a good income will be gone." To meet this argument in some measure I now propose that, in addition to the salaries paid to advocates by the State, a good fee be paid to them in each case, out of the costs realised from the suitor who loses the case. This would make a considerable addition to the advocates' salaries, but would not by any means make it possible for lawyers to acquire colossal fortunes such as were acquired by Sir Rash Behary Ghose and Sir Taraknath Palit. To seekers of colossal fortunes lie open the fields of commerce and big industrial enterprises.

My proposal for the deposit of amounts in a Court as a provision for the realisation of costs from losing

litigants appears to me now not to be a good one. I now think that no demand for deposits should be made before the institution of suits, but that costs be realised from ihe vanquished suitor after the last appeal is decided.

When Mahatma Gandhi and his adherents began their crusade against courts of law and lawyers, the judicial machinery proposed as a substitute was arbitration. But how could a practicable system of arbitration be set up? Where could arbitrators sufficiently mentally equipped, sufficiently leisured and sufficiently numerous be found? And where also could be found the very valuable help usually rendered to the administration of justice by trained legal practitioners?

12. SELF-DETERMINATION AND INDIA'S FUTURE POLITICAL STATUS.

From the Modern Review for January 1923.

When President Wilson put forth his now famous doctrine of Self-determination before the world he seems to have had in his mind the idea that the doctrine would ultimatley assert itself in a practical form all over the world. He could be under no illusion, however, that any comprehensive working out of the doctrine could be attempted in his own time, for in the very redistributions of territory that followed the Great War the doctrine was set at nought. The doctrine was, however, a fruitful one, fated not to die, but to flourish and finally to triumph, for it is one whose aim is a world-wide promotion of human welfare. No such idea can ever die.

The holding of one people in subjection by another has been part of the political evolution of the human race. But such subjection being not conducive to the greatest good of mankind, it cannot endure for ever. Subjection has led in many cases to assimilation and even to amalgamation. But in all cases assimilation or amalgamation has not been possible, and so in some parts of the world divergent streams of population have been living on the same soil, with a tendency, however, to assimilation. Difference of religious beliefs has been a mighty bar to amalgamation.

In some parts of the world, millions of subject people are dominated by a few thousands of dominant people, as for instance, in West Africa, where millions of Negroes are held in subjection by a few thousands of Frenchmen. A prince of Dahomey has been called to the bar in Paris. Why then cannot the entire Negro population of Dahomey be raised to the French standard of civilization? Even under the galling yoke of slavery, men of the Negro race in the United States, the West Indian Islands and Brazil, have risen sufficiently high, mentally and morally, to be competitors of men of European descent.

The obvious destiny of backward peoples is then to rise ultimately to the height attained by forward peoples. Extremely backward peoples, like the Andamanese, who are of a very low grade of mental capacity, cannot be lifted up to a progressive state of civilization. Their ultimate destiny must be extinction, such as has overtaken the Tasmanian race. Of some tribes such as the Eskimo, the habitat is such as to make a progressive state of civilization impossible. But being well adapted to their surroundings they are not likely to die out. It is for their fellow-men of favourable climates to help them so far as is possible.

Christian missionaries have done a vast deal for the advancement of backward peoples. Is it not time now for lay philanthropic missions being organized for helping on backward peoples?

When forward peoples like the English and the French acquire sovereignty over comparatively backward but civilised peoples like the Indians and the Indo-Chinese, or over uncivilized peoples like those of Ashanti and Dahomey, the righteous course for them is to assume the rôle of protectors, instructors and helpers, with a view to raise them to the self-governing stage. The idea of such a righteous course has not yet made much way in the world. The idea has been practically acted upon only by the United States of America, in its rule over the Philippine Islands. This has been, however, owing to peculiar circumstances. The United States is larger than all Europe, and so is in no need of foreign possessions. It is again under the reflex influence of the Monroe Doctrine. It is ready to let go the non-American Philippine Islands, but has no scruple to hold the valuable American island of Porto Rico, conquered at the same time as the Philippines. The example of America in regard to the Philippines cannot fail, however, to help the cause of good government of subject peoples all over the world. France in its government of subject peoples shows considerable liberality.

For the Government of territories mandated after the Great War certain liberal provisions have been laid down. But how these provisions are to be successfully worked is still a problem. The League of Nations may eventually develop itself into an instrument for the maintenance of accord all over the world, but its

present composition and mode of working are quite open to adverse criticism.

The Great War has done a world of evil to mankind, but it has done one great good to India. India's very effective participation in the War has induced the British People to hold out to India the prospect of becoming a self-governing Dominion like Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand. We have been promised *Swaraj* (self-government) indeed, but powerful vested interests of sections of the British people stand as obstacles in the way. In the face of the promised *Swaraj* the late British Premier, Mr. Lloyd George, did not scruple to affirm that the "steel frame" of the British Civil Service in India was to permanently hold the country in its grasp. Some measure of self-government, unsatisfactory though it is, has been granted, and some more is bound to follow. Widespread Indian discontent on the one hand, and wise British statesmanship on the other, will not allow the door to self-government to be closed. Co-operation of all classes of Indians has to be secured by the Indian Government, as is desired by the present British Premier, Mr. Bonar Law.

The title of *Empire* for India requires to be repudiated and that of *Dominion* adopted instead. All the British Dominions together are usually called the British Empire. Why should India be an Empire within an Empire? Perhaps India came to be called

an Empire because of the word implying autocratic imperial sway. The biggest self-governing unit of the British Empire, Canada, calls itself a Dominion, and so does the smallest, New Zealand.

The principle of Self-determination working among Indians cannot fail to bring about a distribution of the Indian territory into provinces on the basis of language. Language is the right foundation of nationality, and so there are in reality as many nations in India as there are well-developed languages, though these nations may not be called such, but all together, for political ends, be called a nation, on the ground of their being all natives of the one country, India.

I have dealt with this matter in detail in my article "The Partition of Bengal," pp. 81 to 89.

The division of India into provinces on a linguistic basis would be only one element for the good Government of the country. Good Government in full measure would be a necessary result of the *Swaraj* that has to be won, and *Swaraj* has to be strenuously striven for by the Indian peoples on pacific lines.

When *Swaraj* would be attained and India would become a member of the British Empire on a really equal footing with Britain, Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand, could India tolerate the possession by Portugal and France of portions of Indian territory? Certainly it could not. The Portuguese and French possessions are all very small bits of territory with the exception only of Goa.

These possessions must be acquired by India by pacific means. Purchase by a money payment seems to be the only way of dealing with the Portuguese possessions. For the French possessions an exchange arrangement is feasible. Mauritius with its present dependencies, and its former dependency of the Seychelles, were old French possessions, and are still substantially French in spite of more than a hundred years of British rule. The large element of people of French descent in the islands would be glad to return to France, and in French eyes Mauritius has perhaps a sort of sacredness as being the scene of the French classic tale of *Paul et Virginie* (*Paul and Virginia*). The numerous Indian immigrants in Mauritius would be a sort of equivalent to the Indian population of French India, which may well be transferred to India, in return for Mauritius and its dependencies, which England may be persuaded to retrocede to France. Altogether the value of Mauritius and dependencies is far higher than that of French India. But the two values may be equalised by a distribution of the New Hebrides Islands in the South Pacific between England and France in such a way that England may have a much larger share of them than France. Under the present system of dual control the interests of England and France in the islands are held to be equal. The petty Portuguese and French settlements in India may retain their historical continuity by remaining as small republics with full freedom of internal administration and owing

allegiance to India as the republic of Hamburg owed to the late German Empire.

No sober-minded man can think that, immediately or in the near future, a severance of the connection between India and England would be beneficial to India. But the question has been raised as to whether the connection should be a perpetual one or not. In the natural course of things the connection cannot be a perpetual one, however long it may last. Iniquity now reigns over international dealings, as, for instance, the interdiction of free immigration, and will apparently reign long. So long England's helping hand will be a positive gain to India.

Again, monarchical feeling is now very strong in India. This feeling exists too in England and may continue to exist long, for the Crown is the bond that now holds together the British Dominions. But this bond cannot endure for ever. Crowns have disappeared elsewhere in Europe, notably in Germany, where there were lately a lot of hereditary rulers of all grades from Emperor down to petty Prince, and where but lately Kaiser Wilhem II openly avowed his belief in the divine right of kings. Even China, with its long life of stiff conservatism, has recently cast off its monarch of semi-divine repute; and Muhammadans, typically conservative long, have now in Turkey cast off the Sultan in spite of his holy character as Khalif. Monarchy, resting, as it does, on the principle of inheritance of a public function,

cannot consist with the most advanced stage of political development. So Britain cannot remain a monarchy for ever.

When Britain becomes a republic, Canada, and the other British Dominions must also become such. All these republics are likely to range themselves beside the great American Republic, which is even now the foremost of English-speaking countries. All the English-speaking republics may federate themselves together and thus exercise a controlling influence for good over the rest of the world. It will be time then for India to become an independent State and to be represented as such in the World-Council that may take the place of the present defective League of Nations. Britain and British Dominions cannot have any reasonable objection to such an arrangement. The English-speaking world in itself would be supreme in the world. Extent of territory, magnitude of natural resources, numerical strength of population and physical and mental vigour of population, all combined, would make it supreme.

---

13. INDIA'S TWO GREAT GIFTS TO THE WORLD.

From the Modern Review for December 1923.

Of two of her great gifts to the world India may justly feel proud. One, which is in the intellectual sphere, is the decimal scale of notation; and the other, which is in the moral sphere, is the *Ahimsā* doctrine.

The decimal scale of notation has spread itself all over the world, and has greatly promoted the progress of Mathematics. The Arabs adopted it from India and carried it to Europe, where it long went by the name of the Arabic notation, and to other lands where they carried the faith of Islam, and Europe has carried it to America, Australasia and South Africa. With the Buddhist faith it made its way to Eastern Asia. The idea that it is an invention of the Arabs has persisted even to the present day in Europe, where but lately one of Europe's most cultured men, Mr. H. G. Wells, pronounced it to be an invention of the Arabs. It is, however, now generally admitted that the Arabs got their notation from the Hindus. In this connection the testimony of a highly cultured Musalman gentleman of Bengal, Sir Abdur Rahim, may well be cited. In a speech, delivered by him at the Calcutta Madrasa on the 12th March, 1923, and reported in the *Calcutta Review* for April-May 1923.

speaking of the Islamic world of early days, he said as follows :—

"The Muslims always freely acknowledged their indebtedness to those who taught them anything: they learnt Mathematics from the Hindus and named the science Hindisa." (P. 10 of the *Review*).

Apart from all historical testimony, there is internal evidence which conclusively proves that the decimal scale of notation could not have been an Arabian invention. The Arabian system of writing is from right to left. But numerical figures in Arabic are written from left to right, in Indian fashion. The numerical figure for 10 in Arabic is written, not with a dot to the left of the figure for 1, but with a dot to the right of it, and this is the method of writing all numerical figures in Arabic. In 365 written in Arabic the order of the digits is the same as in 365, written in English, i.e., from left to right and not from right to left as 563. The Arabic digits, again for 1, 2, and 3 are, respectively, very like the Devanagari digits for the same, as a glance at them will show.

Hindu civilization is of much longer standing than the European. There have been many more generations of civilized Hindus than of civilized Europeans. So humane feeling has grown to a greater height in India than in Europe. The killing of animals for food came to be condemned, and the doctrine of *Ahimsā paramo dharmah* (non-killing is the supreme virtue) came to be proclaimed in India long antecedent to the

age of Buddha to whom the doctrine is usually ascribed. The doctrine is professed and practised by the Jains, the founder of whose creed was not Mahāvīra, who was only a reformer of the creed and a contemporary of Buddha, but Pārsva, who is believed by scholars to have lived about 750 B.C., i.e., about 150 years before the age of Buddha and Mahāvīra. Again, the Brahman caste over most, though not all, parts of India, are abstainers from animal food and so are adherents of the doctrine. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the Jains and the Buddhists drew their *Ahimsā* idea from the antecedent Brahmanic creed. It is not in the natural order of things that Brahmans should borrow from Jains or Buddhists. Beef-eating was at one time common among Brahmans, but this has been abjured not only by Brahmans, but also by all other Hindus. But the Indian *Ahimsā* doctrine has failed after all to drive out killing from the land of its birth. Fighting among men, with its slaughter of thousands, has continued in it, and killing of animals for food is avoided only by Jains everywhere and by Brahmans in most parts of India. *Ahimsā* has been pushed too far by Jains, who would not kill even hurtful creatures.

Buddhism has widely diffused the *Ahimsā* doctrine over Eastern Asia, and though it has not succeeded in stamping out utterly the killing of animals it has stopped it largely and so has fostered the growth of the humane spirit. In Europe and America the *Ahimsā*

spirit is also growing, and there are now in those continents, large numbers of people who are vegetarians using only milk and milk-products and eggs as adjuncts to purely vegetable substances. These adjuncts involve no killing of any animal. Hindus who abstain from the use of flesh and fish abstain also from the consumption of eggs, obviously because eggs ultimately produce living animals. The objection to eggs is not quite reasonable, for the egg contains no living creature and the use of eggs as food involves no killing of animals.

Hunting, fowling and fishing are called *sports* in the English-speaking world. But there have been English-speaking men who have condemned such sports. Wordsworth in his "Hart-Leap Well" condemns hunting and teaches us

"Never to blend our pleasure or our pride
With sorrow of the meanest thing that feels."

John Stuart Mill on one occasion declined to join a fishing party as he thought fishing to be a cruel sport. But, after all, in the Christian world at present vast numbers of cattle, sheep and swine are slaughtered for being eaten, and heaps of fish and large numbers of birds go towards that end. Considering all this one finds it hard to conceive that the killing by men of animals for food can ever cease to be. But in the course of ages it is quite possible that the human mind would change so far that what is now held to be reprehensible by a comparatively small section of men would

be considered reprehensible by multitudes of men. The case of alcoholic drinks furnishes an example of this. The feeling against such drinks has grown so keen in the United States of America, a country of more than 100 million inhabitants, that it has led to a prohibition of their use in the country. Who could have thought a hundred years ago that such a prohibition would come about? It is the wide spread of the conviction that the use of alcoholic drinks produces baneful effects on the community that has brought about the prohibition. This prohibition in America is indeed open to the very serious objection that it is a case of oppression of the minority by the majority. In America there is a strong minority in favour of the use of alcoholic drinks, and the members of this minority are driven to all sorts of shifts to evade the prohibition, which can have only a very injurious effect on the community. The movement against alcoholic drinks is making its way in Europe too. Here restriction of production and sale may be the course ultimately adopted instead of absolute prohibition. It is quite possible then that the use of flesh and fish for food may come to be looked upon as inimical to the sympathetic side of man's nature and so to be interdicted. It cannot be maintained that a carnivorous regimen is necessary for the proper nourishment of the human body. Science has proved that the seeds of leguminous plants can furnish in abundant measure the nitrogenous elements found in flesh and fish.

There are parts of the world, however, where animal food is the only food available for man, no plants being able to grow there. The Eskimos of the Arctic regions have only seals and some other marine animals to live upon. How can humane sympathetic instincts grow there so strong as to induce the dwellers of those regions to give up killing animals for food and clothing? The Eskimos cannot fail to become literate in time by contact with Europeans and Americans and to know of the *Ahimsā* idea that has grown up in parts of the world more favourable to human progress than their own. But the avoidance of killing animals for food would be an impossibility to them. All that is possible seems to be their being helped to learn to kill without causing pain, i.e., to kill by some handy process like electrocution. In connection with this it may be urged by advocates of animal food for mankind that if killing without causing pain be allowable for the Eskimos, why should it not be allowable for all mankind? But necessity which can be pleaded in the case of the Eskimos, cannot be pleaded in the case of the inhabitants of more favoured regions which can supply enough of vegetable substances and milk and eggs for human food. Who can say that the ideal of a non-animal diet is not higher than the ideal of a mixed vegetable and animal diet? In this world of ours we find that it is a scheme of nature that some species of animals live wholly upon vegetables, some upon purely animal food which generally involves the killing of some

animals by others, only a very few species of animals feeding on carrion ; and some other species live partly upon vegetable and partly upon animal food, which also involves killing. Man, generally speaking, belongs to the last class. Some sections of men, however, on grounds of clemency to animal life, have given up killing animals for food. This too has been a process of natural evolution, and as such, we are bound to bow to it, and accept it as a higher ideal than the one now prevailing among the mass of mankind.

---

14. PHASES OF RELIGIOUS FAITH OF A BENGALI OF BRAHMAN BIRTH.

From the Modern Review for August 1924.

I was born in a good Brahman family in the Hooghly district of Bengal, within a distance of only about ten miles from Calcutta. The beliefs of childhood come from the beliefs of older people among whom the child lives. The beliefs of early life change with growth in years. Beliefs in religious matters change however much less than beliefs in secular matters, and the consequence is that the great mass of mankind die in the religious beliefs they inherit from their parents. My early religious beliefs were the common beliefs of Bengali Hindu children. I believed the gods and goddesses of the Hindu mythology to be veritable realities. When at school, however, I learnt something of the Greek and Roman mythologies, my faith in Hindu polytheism came to be shaken. Before going from school to college I ceased to be a Hindu polytheist, and came to believe in one God. My monotheism was of the common type.

In India has prevailed a wide range of religious beliefs. Polytheism with idolatry has been the popular religion. But there have been also religious beliefs connected with systems of philosophy. Of these, four may here be specially mentioned. (1) The high

monotheism of the Vedanta philosophy, which affiliates the human consciousness with *Brahma* (the Supreme Spirit), as in the formula *Tat tvam asi* (That thou art). (2) The Agnostic view of the Sankhya philosophy about the existence of God, as in the formula *Is'vara'siddheh* (of God, no proof). (3) Buddhism, which ignores God. (4) The Atheistic Charvaka philosophy, which dogmatically denies the existence of God. I was not attracted towards Vedantic monotheism, of which I then knew almost nothing.

In the twenty-third year of my age. I came under the influence of Comte's writings, and this influence caused a radical change in the general current of my thoughts. There have been numerous speculations by great thinkers about matters that really lie beyond the reach of the human intellect, and these speculations have given rise to theories which have not been universally accepted. The speculations have nevertheless been of great service to mankind. They have given scope to man's longing to dive into the secrets of nature, and have helped man to come at last to distinguishing the knowable from the unknowable, and ceasing to speculate about the unknowable. Comte's writings first taught me to mark out the knowable from the unknowable, and for this I feel greatly indebted to this great philosopher. I now saw that a First Cause as Creator and Sustainer of the Universe was inconceivable, and I recognised the validity of

Comte's argument that to assume that at the back of the universe which works in accordance with invariable laws, there is a Supreme Being, is to make this Supreme Being a "majestic inertia". The Universe working according to invariable laws cannot by any means be called a majestic inertia, and in my mind the Universe then took the place of God, and the origin of the Universe, I recognised as unknowable. I lost also my faith in the immortality of the soul as being a thing unknowable.

Comte's Religion of Humanity I did not, however, accept. It makes Humanity, *i.e.*, the human race, not only the object of our service but the object also of our supreme reverence as having the dominant influence over our whole life. The Religion of Humanity has won over some very clever adherents, from one of whom, the late Mr. Frederic Harrison, I quote below two passages, and add my comments on them :—

(1) "Religion, in its widest sense, is the combination of *belief* in, and *veneration* for, the Power which man regards as exercising the dominant influence over his whole life."*

(2) "You yourself have power over many things here and there. Mankind has vast power over many things everywhere. Mankind has a vaster and a nobler power over you than all other things put together. And you can work with mankind, and live with mankind, in a way that you cannot with inorganic things."*

* *Religious Systems of the World*, 1908, pp. 741 and 743.

My comments are these:—(1) Has mankind come to regard mankind as exercising "the dominant influence" over mankind's whole life, as exercising greater influence than the sun's heat and light, without which life would be extinct in the world?

(2) Has mankind "a vaster and a nobler power" over mankind than all other things put together including solar heat and light?

Man has attributed human feelings to his God, but it has to be noted that these have been only the nobler human feelings, to the exclusion of the ignoble ones, which along with the nobler ones are bound to be connoted by the term 'humanity'. To man's steady advance we are indeed indebted for the blessings of life we now enjoy, but the evil side of man's nature still remains, and is quite as patent as its noble side: and so it is not easy to understand how Comte and his adherents could make so light of the evil side. The holders of the doctrine of Human Depravity have had plenty of data to take their stand upon. The world's history is full of records of the crimes of man—fighting in battle-fields with its slaughter of thousands, massacre of peaceful inhabitants, raping of women of vanquished peoples, enslaving of fellow human beings, and looting and destroying of valuable property, together with such crimes as are recorded at the present day in every day's newspapers, from deliberate murders down to petty thefts. There are among men a class of people who are called "habitual criminals."

Man's affinity with the ape tribe was announced by Lamarck in his *Philosophie Zoologique* so long ago as the year 1809, and the same theme was dealt with by Huxley in his *Man's Place in Nature* in 1863 and by Darwin in his *Descent of Man* in 1871. Huxley in his *Man's Place in Nature* has the following passage :—

"Our reverence for the nobility of manhood will not be lessened by the knowledge that Man is, in substance and in structure, one with the brutes; for he alone possesses the marvellous endowment of intelligible and rational speech, whereby, in the secular period of his existence, he has slowly accumulated and organised the experience which is almost wholly lost with the cessation of every individual life in other animals, so that now he stands raised upon it as on a mountain top, far above the level of his humble fellows, and transfigured from his grosser nature by reflecting here and there a ray from the infinite source of truth."*

Comte's generalisation of the human race as an organism has done the great good of impressing on men's minds the idea of human solidarity. This solidarity is now hardly a living reality, though it may become such in the future. What organic union is there now between Frenchmen and Bantu subjects of France in French Equatorial Africa? Further, there have been disastrous conflicts among men down to the

* Huxley's *Man's Place in Nature*, Watts & Co, London, 19

Great World War of 1914-1918. The United States of America has to its discredit its colour-prejudice against Negroes with its accompaniment of lynchings of them; and the New American Immigration Law wants to keep out of American soil Japanese and other Asiatics. All this is very far from a recognition of human solidarity.

Comte's ethics makes human welfare the sole object of human endeavour. But a wider sphere does really lie before man. About three hundred years before the birth of Christ, Emperor Asoka of India issued edicts in which "great stress is laid on the imperative duty of respecting the sanctity of animal life, and of treating all living creatures with kindness."* At the present day we have Veterinary Colleges, Veterinary Surgeons, and Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Looking after the welfare of animals, which man is in close contact with and which are useful to him, comes then within the sphere of human duties. Animals that are harmful to him, he is free to destroy.

A word has to be said about Comte's famous Dictum of Live for Others (*Vive pour Autrui*). The dictum has a glamour about it which charmed me greatly when I first came across it. It appeared to me to be a high moral injunction which it was almost impossible to carry out into practice. On reading Herbert Spencer's working out of his ethical theory on the basis of evolution, to which I feel vastly indebted, and

* Vincent Smith's *Asoka*, 1910, p. 25.

his criticism of Comte's dictum, I settled down to the theory of a sound harmony between egoism and altruism.

Science does not teach us to make light of the Universe, of which this world of ours with all its contents is but a minute fragment. If the heavens cannot be said to declare the glory of a supposed Creator, was not Comte's assertion that they declare the glory of a Kepler and a Newton an undue exaltation of man and an undue depreciation of the Universe? Do not the heavens declare a glory of their own? The Universe, taking the place of God, should teach us men the humility that befits us, and should be taken by us to be our supreme guide and controller.

Long after my instruction from Comte's writings, I learnt that Spinoza's Pantheism had taught that "the notion of the world (the universe or cosmos) is identical with the all-pervading notion of God", and I learnt also that Goethe had been a Pantheist. I now thought that I could call myself a Pantheist, and wondered that Pantheism, which in a way reconciles religion and science, had not made sufficient way in the world. Pantheists have not been organised into a body, and it is not known what the number of Pantheists is now in the world. I have no objection to call myself a Pantheist, although the words 'Pantheism' and 'Pantheist' are liable to be objected to as keeping up the idea of *theos* (God). But the *theos* here signifies no personality. 'Mónism' and 'Monist' are

terms now current, but these terms are also objectionable as being not used exclusively in one sense each. 'Universism' and 'Universist', or 'Kosmosism' and 'Kosmosist' may be proposed as terms noway objectionable. In Sanskrit, I would call myself a "*Vis'vavádi*" and my faith "*Vis'vaváda*".

I was glad to read in *The Review of Reviews* for March 1912 an article headed "The Modern View of Religion", which put the Universe in place of God. The article has the following passage :—

"Man must learn to cry when the fierce struggle within him goes on between the vaster and the narrower claims : 'Not my will, O Universe, but thine be done ! ' "

Why attribute *willing* to the Universe ? Its *willing* can only be its working according to invariable laws.

In connection with Spinoza's Pantheism, which merges the conception of God with the Universe, may be considered Herbert Spencer's reconciliation between Religion and Science. Spencer shows that the conception of God as something distinct from the phenomenal world can rightly be only the conception of the Power which we are impelled to infer as lying behind all phenomena, and of which it can only be said that it is different from the phenomena. Spencer thus identifies the conception of God with the Power from which flow all the phenomena. This abstract idea of Power, no believer in a Personal God is likely to accept as identical with his Personal God. The Universe or

Kosmos, which consists of all phenomena *plus* the Power at their back, is identical with the all-pervading conception of God according to Spinoza, so far as I understand his theory. This view may be more acceptable to theists than Spencer's view. In Europe long-continued anthropomorphic conception of God found expression in Pope's well-known lines,

"All are but parts of a stupendous whole,
Whose body nature is and God the soul."

There is a natural tendency in the human mind to exalt consciousness and to depreciate matter. All our knowledge comes from consciousness, and volition, which is an element of consciousness, is not cognizable in matter. In a living animal, consciousness and matter are found working together. The consciousness for its working stands in need of material food, and its working is liable to be greatly disordered by material substances that can cause intoxication. Matter is, therefore, not to be despised.

In this world of ours all the operations of nature are not beneficial to the living beings dwelling on it. Some are disastrous. Cyclones and typhoons, disastrous floods and volcanic eruptions cause great havoc among men and other animals. Another standing evil is the killing and eating of some animals by others. This is a wide-spread natural process, and man in the course of his evolution has only partially emerged out of it. Christianity and Muhammadanism do not show tenderness towards animal life, as does

Buddhism, which enjoins "right livelihood, bringing hurt or danger to no living thing".*

On moral grounds the use of alcoholic drinks has recently been prohibited in the United States of America. On the moral ground of nourishing humane feeling, may not meat-eating and fish-eating come to be prohibited in parts of Europe and America where humane feeling may rise as high as it has risen in parts of India? Already in Europe and America, the eating of meat and fish is decreasing appreciably, and vegetarianism is growing in favour. The usual vegetarian diet includes eggs, milk and milk products.

I append below notes on four special topics:—
(1) Matter and Spirit. (2) Immortality of the Soul. (3) Transmigration. (4) First Cause.

(1) Matter and Spirit:—This world of ours is now believed, on scientific grounds, to have been at one time unfit for the existence of organic life and so of consciousness as we now see it in animals. How organic life first came into existence still remains an unsolved problem, though from what Prof. Schäfer said at the Conference of the British Association for the Advancement of Science held at Dundee a few years ago, science appears to be on the way to solve it. Between the vegetable world and the animal world there is no clear line of demarcation. Sir J. C. Bose has recently discovered even a nervous

* T. W. Rhys-Davids's Paper on Buddhism in *Religious Systems of the World*, 1908, p. 147.

system in plants, and his *Response in the Living and the Non-living* distinctly points to non-living material substances possessing the rudiments of consciousness. An egg has long appeared to me to furnish good evidence of how the germs of consciousness may be associated, in a latent form, with a material substance. The semi-fluid substance within the shell of the egg can exhibit no sign whatever of consciousness. If the egg is kept sufficiently warm for a certain length of time, the semi-fluid substance develops into a conscious animal.

Theosophists recognise no distinction between matter and spirit. This view I am unable to understand, for between what is called matter and what is called spirit (by which I understand consciousness of an individual being) there is a clear line of separation.

(2) Immortality of the Soul :—Christians believe only man to possess souls, and the lower animals to possess none. Hindus believe all living beings and even plants to possess souls. If human beings have souls why the lower animals should have none is hardly an intelligible theory. Probably moral responsibility regarded as exclusively belonging to man lies at the root of the idea that man alone has soul.

Within the sphere of our experience we have no knowledge of soul, or, individual consciousness, except in association with body, particularly the nervous system of the body. Yet the belief is almost universal that when a man dies his soul, *i.e.*, his individual

consciousness, exists independently of his body, now lifeless. The belief in the ability of consciousness to exist without any connection with a bodily organism is not an intuitive idea. Were it such, it could not be cast aside by Comte, Herbert Spencer, Huxley and other modern thinkers, as it was cast aside by certain Stoic philosophers of old.—One can be only an Agnostic in respect of this belief, seeing that within human experience consciousness is always connected with a nervous system. How arose the belief is a question not easy of solution. A recent theory, which I first came across in some writing of Tylor's, offers a solution, which I hold to be quite satisfactory. The theory makes dreams the basis of the belief. Men dream of living men whom they know and of dead men whom they knew and whom they dream of as living. Even among civilised people dreams have been believed to represent realities to some extent, at any rate. Among savages dreams would naturally be held to represent realities to a much wider extent, though from the fact of some dreams proving absolutely false, belief in the reality of all dreams could not possibly grow up. Savages would naturally come to believe that during sleep the soul, with a sort of body about it, is able to leave the body and go to different places, and associate with other people, living and dead, and return to the body at waking time.—I wonder that the dream theory was not hit upon earlier.

The doctrine of the immortality of the soul has produced in India and China the evil effect of creating belief in the necessity of offspring for making offerings to the spirits of the dead. The procreating of offspring by all sorts of people, healthy and diseased, has caused wide-spread physical degeneracy in India and China.

(3) Transmigration :—The transmigration theory is confined to Hindus and Buddhists, who regard it as an axiomatic truth. It offers an explanation of the distribution of good fortune and evil fortune in the present life, making the former the fruit of good actions, and the latter the fruit of bad actions in the preceding life. The theory is a plausible one, but has the fatal defect of being an unverifiable hypothesis. Transmigration is believed by Hindus to be a divine ordination and by Buddhists to be a natural one according to the Law of *Karma.*

(4) First Cause :—A First Cause, *i.e.*, a cause which is itself uncaused, is really inconceivable. Yet millions of human beings have held the belief that a Supreme Being whose origin is unknowable has created and has been ruling the Universe. This belief accounts for the origin of the Universe. The belief has been easier for the human mind than to remain satisfied with the belief that the origin of the Universe is unknowable. To hold that the origin of the Universe is unknowable is to hold an impregnable logical position. The idea of God as Creator and Ruler of the Universe is a hypothesis after all, and a hypothesis which is quite unverifiable.

15. MY COLLEGE REMINISCENCES.

(From the Presidency College Magazine for January 1917).

Dear the schoolboy spot we never forget,
Though there we are forgot.

In the above lines, which I quote from memory, Byron gives expression to a feeling that has been present in the minds of all who have ever been pupils at a school or a college. Dear to me are numerous associations connected with my *alma mater*, the Presidency College, and so an invitation received by me on the 19th December, 1916, from the present Principal of the College, to contribute to the coming January number of the college Magazine, an article dealing with my reminiscences of the College, was quite welcome to me, though for an old man of over 78 years of age and in a poor state of health besides, as I am, I thought it was not very easy to respond to the invitation on such short notice. But I do respond to the invitation after all, and this quickly enough too.

I now address myself to the task of noting down briefly such incidents connected with my College life as appear to me likely to be of some interest to the general reader. I shall say something about some of the college officers and about some of my fellow-students.

Mr. J. Sutcliffe was Principal of the College during my college career, which extended over the later fifties of the last century, and while he was absent in England on leave for a rather long time, Mr. L. Clint and Mr. E. Lodge successively officiated for him. I have something to say about Mr. Sutcliffe and Mr. Clint, and also about Professors Cowell, Grapel, Sanders, Jones and Halleur, and about Assistant Professor Mr. Rees. Mr. Sutcliffe taught me and my fellow-students Mechanics in the 2nd year class, so far as I remember, and Hydrostatics and Optics later. About his teaching, I have nothing to specify. His kindness towards his pupils was unbounded, and the clock-work orderliness of his management of the College impressed them strongly. Mr. Sutcliffe's *locum tenens*, Mr. Clint, was a remarkable man in certain respects. His most striking characteristic was his Puritanic straightness of character, and this made him an object of reverence to his pupils. A remark once made by him still clings to my memory. He did not smoke, he said, because smoking was a luxury. The last thing I heard about him was from Dr. S. W. Fallon, Inspector of Schools in Behar, who told me, in the year 1863 or 1864, that he had become a Dissenting Minister in England. This calling fitted him well, I thought. As College Principal, he was watchful in maintaining discipline in a comprehensive way, and, for one thing, he stamped out the evil practice on the part of the boys of spitting on the floor. But rigid disciplinarian

though he was, his pupils loved him well, for they knew him to be their friend. About his teaching, I have a word to say. He taught the 2nd year class in Conic Sections. The appointed text-book for the class was Mr. Thwaytes's book on the subject. This book was the despair of us, students of the class, and I for myself, thoroughly disliked the book. The very objectionable feature of the book, I remember well. Some important matter, it put into a corollary to a proposition, and some subsequent proposition it proved with the help of the corollary. Mr. Clint rescued his pupils from the burdensome task of going through this bad book, and taught the subject by means of notes given by him, the notes being in no long time issued as a booklet, the author's name being given only as "A Graduate of Cambridge."

Professor Cowell was the ablest man and the best scholar on the professorial staff of the College. His teaching of History greatly impressed his pupils and led them to study the subject in a scrutinising spirit. He was a man of a very kindly disposition, and he associated very freely with his pupils, and sought to promote their moral and material welfare. I was a favourite pupil of his, and when I ceased to be his pupil, I occasionally corresponded with him during his stay in, and after his departure from, India, till about five years before his death in February, 1903. Two casual remarks of his, while he was a Professor in the College, I remember. The Indian Mutiny had

thrown India back half a century, he said, and he called the French "the bravest people in Europe."

Mr. Grapel had a supreme command of English, and the paraphrases he gave of passages in English struck his pupils as marvellous. The 3rd and 4th year classes of the College were then so small that they were taught together by Mr. Grapel in his subject, which was English. *Macbeth* and *Addison's Papers in the Spectator* were taught thus. Mr. Grapel was hard upon students who paraphrased *Macbeth* badly, and *Addison's Papers* he honoured by making the boys, one after another, read them out, while he sat quiet in his chair, breaking silence but seldom with a question or a remark. *Addison's Papers in the Spectator,* we 3rd year students had read in the 2nd year class for our Senior Scholarship Examination. To have to read the same *Papers* again was a bother to us, we felt. The poor value of the matter of the *Papers* had made them an object of dislike to me. I liked the simplicity of Addison's style well enough, but the quality of his humour and his skilful portraiture of character I was then too young to be able to properly appreciate. The slight that Mr. Grapel put upon Addison's *Papers* was, therefore, very agreeable to me. To the 4th year students, who were to appear at the first B. A. Examination in the year 1858, Mr. Grapel gave some notes on Addison, I learnt. Mr. Grapel was the first Registrar of the Calcutta University and its organizer.

Mr. Sanders was in charge of the teaching of English Composition to the 2nd year students when I was a 2nd year student myself. He had us drilled in the Rules of Syntax given in Lennie's *Grammar*. As we had learnt these rules at school, we felt it as a hardship to be drilled in the rules again in a College class. We thought we were too advanced for such drilling. But afterwards I came to think better of Mr. Sanders's procedure, in view of the fact that boys at school do not profit as much as is possible by the rules of grammar that they are made to learn. For the test, Mr. Sanders's teaching of English Composition was quite efficient. Mr. Sanders had the Scotchman's grit in him in full measure, and he aimed at thoroughness in whatever he had to do. After I left College, he served in several capacities. He was Inspector of Schools, Professor of English, and for sometime also, Professor of Psychology, Ethics and Logic, at the Presidency College.

In my time the Professor of Psychology, Ethics and Logic was Mr. R. Jones, and he was a good teacher.

Our Professor of Experimental Physics, Physical Geography and Chemistry was Dr. Halleur, of German nationality. He gave us his Chemistry lectures in the Medical College, as our own College had not the appliances necessary for such lectures, and he interested us in Photography, a new art then. It appeared to us strange that he pronounced the word *zinc* as *sink*, for no one of us then knew that the German sound of

z is hardly distinguishable from that of the English sound of s.

Mr. Rees, the Assistant Professor of Mathematics, was a Eurasian, and he was mainly a self-taught man. He had a thorough mastery of the subject he taught and a natural aptitude for effective teaching. Those of his pupils who had any relish for Mathematics felt themselves greatly benefited by his teaching.

A Frenchman, M. Montigny, was our teacher of Gymnastics while we were in the 1st year class. He was all but a dwarf, but had powerful, muscular arms and legs. I had never before seen so short a European, and have hardly ever seen since. We had not long the benefit of his teaching. Those were the Mutiny days, and we lost the use of the College premises with its gymnastic ground, the premises, together with those of the Sanskrit College and the Hindu School, being then occupied by newly-arrived British troops. The Presidency College classes were accommodated in the neighbouring house in which is now held, I understand, the David Hare Training College.

I now come to some of my fellow-students. The two most intellectual young men among them were Hemchandra Banarji and Taraprasad Chatarji. Hemchandra greatly distinguished himself as a Vakil at the High Court Bar and was in the running for a Judgeship. What was of far higher value, however, he won—lasting fame as a poet of high rank. While a student at

College he was very fond of Bengali poetry, and it was he who introduced me to the poetry of Bharatchandra. I was of a shy, retiring disposition, and was overrun besides by melancholy in consequence of the blight of ill-health that lay upon me even in my boyhood. Hemchandra made his advances towards intimacy with me, and most intimate we became, and remained so to the end of his life. His warmth of feeling was extraordinary. The latter years of his life were very unhappy. Loss of health and loss of eyesight were the heavy miseries he had to endure till death came as a deliverance in May, 1903. He and I left our College when we were in the 4th year class, which was then the highest class of the College. For obtaining employments, we gave up the scholarships we held, and we were both employed for sometime in the Military Auditor General's Office, which we soon left, however, for other walks of life. Another 4th year student, Nilmani Kumar, entered the Military Auditor General's Office at about the same time with us, and he stuck to it. On a reorganization of the Office, he came to be placed under the Comptroller of Military Accounts, from whose office, after highly meritorious service he retired in due time. At the College he was a general favourite for his exemplary character and his suave manners. He has long been connected as Honorary Assistant Secretary, with the Association for the Cultivation of Science, and as a literary contributor, with *The Calcutta Journal of*

Medicine, started and long most ably conducted by the eminent founder of the Association, the late Dr. Mahendra Lal Sircar. His title of Hony. Assistant Secretary is now only a courtesy title, he being disabled for work by cataract in the eyes and other complaints. About two years and a half ago he took the lead in founding the Clint Memorial Fund for the award, by the Calcutta University, of an annual money prize to the Bengali student who obtains the highest mark in *Ethics* at the B. A. Examination. This public act of his life has been quite in harmony with his noble character, which all who have known him admire.

Taraprasad possessed a most powerful memory, and he was a voracious reader even while a student at College. No fellow-student of his could approach him in the matter of extent of reading. He afterwards won reputation as a man of extensive knowledge and a very able Deputy Magistrate. He wrote a "Life of Chaitanya", which attracted attention when it was written, and he contributed weighty articles to the English newspaper *The Bengalee* and to the Bengali periodical বঙ্গদর্শন (*Bangadarshan*). He was a very simple-minded man, but was a bit eccentric and forgetful also about the common concerns of life. He was short-lived, dying at about the age of forty-five, I believe; and I was on a most intimate footing with him till his death. I remember a conversation I had with him when we were 3rd year students. I remarked on one occasion that

England and France were destined to lose their position as first-class Powers just as Holland had lost hers, that British North America and Australia would go the way of the United States, and that the Great Powers of the future would be Russia and the United States. Taraprasad disputed this view, and maintained that the superior mental powers of the British people and of the French would enable them to retain their rank as Great Powers. This argument I did not accept, and said that superior mental powers, without adequate material resources, could not enable a nation to retain its position as a Great Power. There ended our conversation on the subject.

Two other class-fellows of mine at College I feel called upon to say something about in a special way. One was Kalimohan Das Gupta and the other was Lalitballabh Sil, or Nullit Bullub Seal, as he wrote his name. Like Hemchandra, Kalimohan became a leading Vakil at the High Court Bar; and he won reputation also as a public speaker. He died a premature death. Lalitballabh died when he was a 4th year student, but he possessed certain marked characteristics which I cannot pass over in silence. He was the best mathematician among us, and he was also the only one among us who properly attended to Drawing, for instruction in which once in a week we had an instructor in Mr. Rowe, Engineer to the Calcutta Municipal Corporation. He made excellent drawings, and as he signed his name as N. B. Seal, Mr. Rowe used to call him *Nota Bene*

Seal. All his fellow-students neglected Drawing, as it was a subject which did not tell at the examinations. He possessed the natural gift of composing Bengali verses offhand, and he was something of a wag too. On one occasion Prof. Ram Chunder Mitter repeated in the class-room the following verses composed by an English gentleman (Dr. Wilson was the name mentioned, if I remember right) on some young Hindus taking to beef-eating —

> O ye Hindus, have ye heard
> What hath recently occurred,
> The Hindu eateth beef,
> The Hindu eateth beef.

Lalitballabh came forward at once with an extempore Bengali translation of the verses :—

> শুন রে ভাই হিঁদুগন
> কি হয়েছে কীর্ত্তন,
> গরু খেয়েছে হিঁদু,
> গরু খেয়েছে হিঁদু।

Of his waggery I feel tempted to give an instance. A young man from Dacca College, Ambikacharan Bose, became one of us in the 2nd year class. He spoke Bengali with the East Bengal accent, and this proclaimed him a বাঙাল (Báñál). Lalitballabh at once dubbed him ফটিকচাঁদ বাবু (Phatikcháñd Bábu), and the class took up the name from Lalitballabh. Phaṭikcháñd is a common enough name in East Bengal, and is very rare, if at all current, in Western Bengal. So it is a

typical East Bengal name. After long years of separation I met Ambikacharan more than once at the time of the Boer War. When first we met, I reminded him of the sobriquet Lalitballabh had put upon him, and he smiled to hear of it.

It is now my turn to make some passing remarks about such of my class-fellows as came to hold high appointments in the public service or to acquire a claim to notice otherwise. The ablest among these was Bishnuchandra Dutt, who came to hold a very high post in the Postal Department. The next ablest was Jadabchandra De (B. L. in 1860) who became a Sub-Judge very quickly, but died early. Three others Khetraprasad Mukharji (B. L. in 1864), Ganeshchandra Chaudhuri and Kantichandra Bhaduri also became Sub-Judges. Pratapchandra Chatarji (B. L. in 1860) got a Deputy Magistrateship. Khetramohan Bose (B. A. in 1860 from the Engineering College, the degree of B. C. E. or the later one of B. E. not being instituted then), able and upright, became an Executive Engineer, and retired early from service. He is still living. Krishnachandra Ray acquired special distinction by his brilliant success as Head Master of the Hindu and Hare Schools, and he wrote also a notable book, the well-known *Phrases and Idioms*. Benimadhab Mukharji came to be Interpreter in the High Court. Kalachand Haldar and Kamakhyanath Acharji became Medical graduates, Kalachand winning Honours in Medicine in 1863, and Kamakhyanath, taking his

L. M. S. degree in 1862. Kalachand, so far as I know, lived by private practice to the end of his life. Kamakhyanath served as an Assistant Surgeon, and is now a pensioner.

I shall conclude my paper with mentioning the names of those among my seniors at College by one year, and also the names of those among my juniors by one year, who attained high renown in after-life. Bunkim Chunder Chatterjea, Keshub Chunder Sen and Chunder Madhub Ghose were my seniors ; and Romesh Chunder Mitter, Calica Doss Dutt and Peary Mohun Mookerjee were my juniors. Of the persons I have named, Sir Chunder Madhab Ghose, Kt., and Raja Peary Mohun Mookerjee, C S. I., M. A., B. L., are still living. May they live long !

A FEW SELECTED OPINIONS ON SOME OF THE ARTICLES.

I. BENGALI, SPOKEN AND WRITTEN.

(1) "I have been very much struck by the originality and power displayed in your friend Babu Syamacharan Ganguli's article on Bengali. I think it, on the whole, one of the best and most original essays that I have ever published in the (Calcutta) Review. * * I think his abilities ought to be more widely known."

Letter dated 30. 10. 1877 from Mr. (afterwards Sir) Roper Lethbridge to Mr. Chunder Nath Bose through whom the article was sent.

(2) "Babu Syamacharan Ganguli contributed an article on Bengali in the *Calcutta Review* last year. It is an excellent article. On many points his views are quite sound and acceptable, but he has gone a bit too far on some points."

Remarks by Babu (afterwards Rai Bahadur) Bunkim Chunder Chatterjea in the *Bangadarsan* of Jaistha 1285 B.S. (Translated from Bengali).

(3) "All this has already been said, and in far greater detail, by Babu Syamacharan Ganguli in an excellent article in the *Calcutta Review* for the year 1877. He sums the matter up in the following words, which are of special value as coming from a well-known scholar, whose native language is Bengali."

Dr. (afterwards Sir George) Grierson's *Linguistic Survey of India*, Part I, Vol. V., p. 16.

(4) "I have read your well-reasoned and forcibly expressed views with much pleasure and profit. I agree with you on many of the points you have discussed, but I am bound to add that I differ on some of them. * * I think it desirable that it should be translated into Bengali."

Letter dated 10. 7. 1905 from Sir Gooroo Dass Banerjee.

2. PARTITION OF BENGAL—ITS ANNULMENT AND REDISTRIBUTION OF PROVINCES.

"On * * I received your thoughtful article in the Modern Review on the Partition."

Letter dated 14. 12. 1911 from Sir Alfred Croft.

3. STEPS TOWARDS REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

(1) "Thanks for the graceful and interesting paper. It will be considered, as is fitting, in one of the approaching numbers of our journal (*La Paix Par Le Droit*)."

Letter dated 24. 1. 1914 from Prof. Charles Richet, President, Peace Association of Paris. (Translated from French.)

(2) "I am greatly obliged by your pamphlet 'Reduction of Armaments.' I cannot but wonder how, never having been out of India, you have acquired such facility in composition and writing of English."

Letter dated 10. 2. 1914 from Mr. Andrew Carnegie.

(3) "Your new article in the *Modern Review* I have read with interest and I marvel at the energy with which you are still able to tackle difficult themes with such ease and lucidity."

Letter dated 21. 1. 1915 from Sir Henry Cotton.

5. THE REV. J. KNOWLES'S SCHEME FOR THE ROMANIZATION OF ALL INDIAN WRITING.

"The latter (article) I have read with great interest, and I only hope that when I reach your age I may still be able to exhibit the same mental activity and balanced opinion."

Letter dated 25. 3. 1918 from Sir George Grierson.

6. THE UNDESIRABILITY OF DEVANAGARI BEING ADOPTED AS THE COMMON SCRIPT FOR ALL INDIA.

(1) "Very many thanks for the April number of the *Modern Review* containing your article on Devanagari. It is most interesting."

Letter dated 28. 5. 1918 from Sir Geroge Grierson.

(2) "Your philological articles deal with subjects that used to be very close to me, and I highly approve of them."

Letter dated 16. 4. 1919 from Sir Alfred Croft.

7. SELF-DETERMINATION AS THE BASIS OF JUST PEACE.

"I will call it to the President's attention at the earliest convenient time."

Letter dated 20. 2. 1919 from President Wilson's Confidential Secretary.

8. THE INTERNATIONAL PHONETIC SCRIPT.

(1). "I think most of your criticisms are quite sound."

Letter dated 24. 5. 1919 from Dr. J. D. Anderson, I. C. S. (Retired).

(2). "The paper will be placed on the table and will no doubt be valued by those of our members who are interested in phonetics."

Letter dated 29. 5. 1919 from the Secretary, Royal Asiatic Society, London.

(3). "I read it with pleasure, and passed it on to our Editor.

Letter dated 29. 5. 1919 from the Secretary, the British Esperanto Association.

9. ESPERANTO *versus* ENGLISH INTERNATIONALIZED.

(1). "I have read it with real enjoyment, interest and sympathy, and am amazed at so energetically written a production from so aged and venerable a source."

Letter dated 27. 11. 1919 from Dr. J. D. Anderson.

(2). "You have certainly considered the question thoroughly, and raised several points which require discussion."

Letter dated 30. 12. 1919 from Sir George Grierson.

(3). "Your paper on 'Esperanto *versus* English Internationalized' is full of interest, and is written in a very attractive manner."

Letter dated 9. 3. 1920 from Sir Alfred Croft.

11. Reform of Fighting in Courts of Law.

"I write to acknowledge your letter of the 28th October with enclosures which His Excellency has seen."

Letter dated 2. 11. 1921 from Viceroy Lord Reading's Assistant Private Secretary.

13. Self-Determination and India's Future Political Status.

(1). "It (the article) has been laid before His Excellency the Viceroy who was interested to hear your views."

Letter dated 12. 1. 1923 from Viceroy Lord Reading's Assistant Private Secretary.

(2). "I have read with the greatest interest your thoughtful paper on Self-determination and I can honestly say that I agree in general with the whole scope of it; though of course many of your anticipated changes could be realised only in a more or less distant future. But the chief point of interest with me was the proof that the paper gave of the sanity and strength of your intellect; and it gives no sort of indication that this essay is the last you will put forward on public affairs, and for the public good."

Letter dated 14. 2. 1923 from Sir Alfred Croft.

(3) "I must thank you for the copy of the article on Self-Determination, which exhibits all your accustomed clarity and vigour of thought

Letter dated 23. 1. 1923 from Sir George Grierson.

Printed by SATYAKINKAR BANERJI, B A.
AT THE COTTON PRESS
57, Harrison Road, Calcutta